





# A VOICE OF WARNING TO THE CHURCH,

OR THE

*Integrity of her Articles Vindicated;*

WHEREIN

THE VIEWS OF THE REFORMED ENGLISH CHURCH AND  
HER EARLY FATHERS,

ON THE SUBJECT OF

## BAPTISMAL REGENERATION,

ARE FAITHFULLY EXHIBITED,

BY

THE REV. JOHN SPURGIN,

VICAR OF HOCKHAM, NORFOLK.

---

SECOND EDITION, CONSIDERABLY ENLARGED.

---

WITH

## AN APPENDIX

ON

CHURCH GOVERNMENT, OR THE APOSTOLICAL  
SUCCESSION;

BEING CHIEFLY A COMPILATION FROM WRITERS OF THE HIGHEST AUTHORITY.

---

“I speak as unto wise men, judge ye what I say.”—1 Cor. x. 15.

---

**Norwich:**

CHARLES MUSKETT, OLD HAYMARKET.

LONDON: L. AND G. SEELEY, 169, FLEET STREET;

J. NISBET AND CO., BERNERS STREET.

AND ALL BOOKSELLERS.

1843.



# A VOICE OF WARNING TO THE CHURCH,

&c. &c.

## PROGRESS OF THE REFORMATION.

### Articles of Religion.

HENRY VIII. 1509—1547.

THE Articles of Religion adopted by Henry VIII. and the Convocation in 1536, retained many of the papal doctrines and ceremonies, such as, the Sacrament of Penance, Transubstantiation, the Use of Images, the Invocation of Saints, the Sprinkling of Holy Water, the Bearing of Candles on Candlemas-day, the Giving of Ashes on Ash-Wednesday, the Bearing of Palms on Palm-Sunday, the Creeping to the Cross and Kissing it on Good-Friday, together with Prayer for the Dead, and Masses. The Article on Baptism states—

‘As touching the Holy Sacrament of Baptism, we will, that all Bishops and Preachers shall instruct and teach our people committed by us unto their spiritual charge, that they ought and must, of necessity, believe certainly all those things, which hath been always by the whole consent of the church approved, received, and used in the Sacrament of Baptism, that is to say, . . . . .  
*That it is offered unto all men, as well infants as such as have the use of reason, that by Baptism they shall have remission of sins and the grace and favour of God, according to the saying of St. John, ‘Whoso believeth and is baptized shall be saved.’ Item, that the promise of grace and everlasting life, which promise is adjoined unto the Sacrament of Baptism, pertaineth not only unto such as have the use of reason, but also to infants, innocents, and children; and they ought therefore and must needs be baptized: and that by the Sacrament of Baptism, they do also obtain remission of their sins, the grace and favour of God, and be made thereby the very sons and children of God: insomuch as infants and children dying in their infancy shall undoubtedly be saved thereby.* OR ELSE NOT.’ . . . . .  
*Item.* That men or children having the use of reason, and willing and desiring to be baptized, shall, by virtue of that Holy Sacrament, obtain the grace and remission of all their sins, if they shall come thereunto perfectly and truly repentant and contrite of all their sins before committed, and also perfectly and constantly confessing and believing all the Articles of our Faith, according as it was mentioned in the article before, OR ELSE NOT. And finally, that



‘they shall have firm credence and trust in the promise of God, *‘adjoined to the said Sacrament*, that is to say, That in and by the ‘said Sacrament which they shall receive, God the Father giveth ‘unto them, for his Son Jesus Christ’s sake, *remission of sins and the ‘grace of the Holy Ghost*, whereby they be newly regenerated and ‘made the very children of God, according to the saying of Christ ‘and his Apostle St. Peter, ‘Repent and be baptized every one of ‘you,’ &c.; and according also to the saying of St. Paul, (Titus iii. ‘5, 6, 7), ‘Not by works of righteousness,’ &c.’\*

These extracts from Henry’s Articles demonstrate that, together with a variety of other popish doctrines and ceremonies, the spiritual blessings of regeneration and remission of sin were distinctly maintained to be ‘adjoined to the Sacrament of Baptism.’—In infant baptism these blessings were held to be absolute; and in adult baptism they were asserted to be conferred, although with some reserve.

#### • EDWARD VI. 1547—1553.

Upon the accession of Edward, an immediate revision of Henry’s Articles was suggested; but Cranmer, then Archbishop of Canterbury, with his usual caution, was of another mind.—He thought it desirable that freedom should be left for the exercise of religious opinions, for a season, as Burnet tells us, ‘to open and ventilate ‘the matter in public disputations and books written about them for ‘some years, before they should go too hastily to determine them; ‘lest, if they went too fast to that affair, it would not be so decent ‘to make alterations afterwards, nor could the clergy be of a sudden ‘brought to change their old opinions.’† From these considerations, the alteration of Henry’s Articles was delayed for five years, that is, till the year 1552, when, after much deliberation, all Henry’s Articles were laid aside, and forty-two new Articles were agreed upon, by Convocation, in their stead, and published by the King’s authority, as is declared in their enunciation, ‘for the avoiding ‘diversities of opinions, and stablishing consent touching true religion.’—Among these forty-two Articles of King Edward, the 26th, on the Sacraments, declares ‘Our Lord Jesus Christ gathered his ‘people into a society, by Sacraments, *very few in number*, most ‘easy to be kept and of *most excellent signification*,‡ that is to say,

\* Burnet’s *Hist. of the Reformation*, Oxford edit. Vol. 1, Part ii. 457—474.

† Ibid. Vol. 2, Part i., p. 307.

‡ The Sacraments are represented in this Article as *simple and significant*; and, viewed *alone* in the light of Holy Scripture, they are such.—It is to be lamented indeed, that, from the earliest ages of the Christian church, the Sacraments have been made both *complex and mysterious*: and hence, at different times, have become the subjects of gross corruption and misrepresentation.—At the present crisis, the wisdom of the true church of Christ, is to ‘cease from man’—to read with ‘godly jealousy’ the publications of the day;—and to remember that the great fundamental truth, on which the church of England is founded, is—THE BIBLE—THE BIBLE ALONE—IS THE RELIGION OF PROTESTANTS.—(Art. VI.)

Baptism and the Supper of the Lord. The Sacraments were not ordained of Christ to be gazed upon, or to be carried about, but that we should duly use them; and in such only as worthily receive the same, they have a wholesome effect or operation, not, as some say, '*Ex opere operato*,' which terms, as they are strange and utterly unknown to the Holy Scripture, so do they yield a sense, which savoureth of little piety, but of much superstition: but they that receive them unworthily, receive to themselves damnation.' And in the 28th of Edward's Articles, on Baptism, it is distinctly asserted, 'Baptism is not only a SIGN of profession and MARK of difference, whereby Christian men are discerned from others that be not christened: but it is also A SIGN OF REGENERATION OR NEW BIRTH, whereby, as by an instrument, they that receive Baptism rightly, are grafted into the church;—the promises of forgiveness of sin, and of our adoption to be the sons of God by the Holy Ghost, are visibly signed and sealed:—Faith is confirmed and Grace increased, by virtue of prayer unto God.—The custom of the church for baptizing young children is both to be commended, and by all means to be retained in the church.\*

The difference between the language and sentiments set forth in the Articles published by Henry in 1536, when the reformers themselves were only just emerging from papal darkness, and the Articles published in the time of Edward in 1552, when the reformers were advancing to man's estate in spiritual things, ought not to be unnoticed.—*Their progress in the discovery of divine truth was rapid.*†

(1.) Henry's Articles assert 'That the promise of grace and everlasting life is *adjoined* to the Sacrament of Baptism,' and that 'by the Sacrament of Baptism remission of sins is obtained;—while Edward's Articles again and again declare 'That Baptism is the sign of regeneration or new birth,' and that in Baptism 'the forgiveness of sins and our adoption to be the sons of God are *visibly signed and sealed*.'—The Articles of Edward also warn the church against the popish doctrine of the "*Opus operatum*" of both sacraments, declaring these words to be 'strange and utterly unknown to the Holy Scriptures,' and that 'they yield a sense which savoureth of little piety, but of *much superstition*.'

(2.) Henry's Articles also affirm the necessity of Infant Baptism, on the ground, 'That infants dying in their infancy shall *undoubtedly be saved by Baptism, or else not*;' and again, 'That infants dying in their infancy must needs be christened, because they be born in original sin, which sin must needs be remitted, and which cannot be done but by the Sacrament of Baptism:—while the Articles of Edward simply affirm the necessity of Infant Baptism, on the ground of ancient usage, thus: 'The custom of the church for baptizing young children is both to be commended, and by all means to be retained in the church.'‡

\* Burnet's *Hist. of the Reformation*, Oxford edit. Vol. 2, Part ii. 299, 300.

† Cranmer and Latimer both signed Henry's Articles.

‡ KING EDWARD THE SIXTH'S CATECHISM was published in 1553, two months before the death of that prince, and was one of the last acts of the

(3.) And in addition to these considerations, it ought not to be forgotten, that the Council of Trent, called together by the Pope, '*for the reformation of the manners of the Romish church, and for the extinction of heretics,*' was held about this time—that is, from 1545 to 1563—and the proceedings of that assembly may serve to throw much light upon the prevailing sentiments of the reformers of that day.—At the seventh session held in 1547, the Sacraments of Baptism and Confirmation were the subject of debate; and we are informed, 'That in that popish assembly there was an *entire unanimity in the condemnation of the reformers for denying that the Sacraments confer grace.*'\* What a conclusive proof of the sentiments adopted by the Protestant reformers, from the testimony of enemies, even the papists themselves!

And in confirmation of this point, it may be observed, that among other Canons passed at this seventh session of the Council of Trent (*"Of the Sacraments"*) were these:—CANON VI. 'If any one shall say, That the Sacraments of the New Testament do not contain Grace which they imply; or that they do not confer that Grace upon them that do not refuse it—they being only, as 'twere, external

reformers in his reign. It received the sanction of the Convocation of 1552, in which Edward's Articles were settled, and may therefore be referred to as containing the ultimate and decided sentiments of the English church, established under Edward. The title prefixed to it is this: "*A Short Catechism or Plain Instruction, containing the Sum of Christian Learning, set forth by the King's Majesty's Authority, for all Schoolmasters to teach, 1553;*" and the following questions and answers are to be found on the Sacraments:—

'MASTER. Tell me what thou callest Sacraments.

'SCHOLAR. They are certain customary, reverent doings and ceremonies, 'ordained by Christ, that, by them, HE might put us in remembrance of his benefits, and WE might declare our profession, that we be of the number of them which are partakers of the same benefits, and which fasten all their affiance in Him; that we are not ashamed of the name of Christ, or be termed Christ's scholars.

'MA. What doth Baptism represent and set before our eyes?

'SCH. That we are, by the Spirit of Christ, new-born and cleansed from sin—that we be members and parts of his church—received into the communion of saints.—For water *signifieth* the Spirit. Baptism is also a figure of our burial in Christ, and that we shall be raised up again, with him, in new life, as I have before declared in Christ's resurrection.'—(*Fathers of the English Church*, Vol. 2, pp. 369, 370.)

We may remark that, in this Catechism, the Sacraments generally are called, 'certain customary, reverent doings and ceremonies—ordained by Christ—that by them HE might put us in remembrance of His benefits, and WE might declare our profession:—and Baptism particularly is here spoken of as 'representing and setting before our eyes, that we are, by the Spirit of Christ, new-born and cleansed from sin:—but neither Edward's Catechism nor Edward's Articles afford the least ground for asserting 'that the Sacraments confer grace.'

\* See Cramp's "*Text-Book of Popery, comprising A Brief History of the Council of Trent,*" p. 108. And in this work, on pages 122, 123, the seven effects of Baptism, enumerated by the compilers of the Romish Catechism, are said to be these:—1. To remit original and actual guilt, however enormous. 2. To remit all the punishment due to sin. 3. To bestow invaluable privileges, such as justification and adoption. 4. To produce abundance of virtues. 5. To unite the soul to Christ. 6. To seal it with an ineffaceable character. 7. And to open the portals of heaven.



'SIGNS of Grace and Righteousness *received by Faith*, and certain *marks* of the Christian Profession whereby men distinguish the Faithful from the Unfaithful: LET HIM BE ACCURSED.'—CANON VIII. 'If any one shall say, That Grace is not conferred by these Sacraments of the New Testament *for the Work finished* (ex opere operato), but that *Faith alone* in the Divine Promise is sufficient for the obtaining of Grace: LET HIM BE ACCURSED.'\*

The canons of the Romish church then distinctly avow, that the inward grace of regeneration is invariably conferred in the Sacrament of Baptism: and the circumstance of the English reformers having introduced into Edward's Article on that very sacrament, (the 28th), the identical expressions which, *only five years before*, had been condemned by the Council of Trent, calling it, 'A sign of profession,' also 'A mark of difference whereby Christian men are discerned from others,' and 'A sign of regeneration or new birth:'—as well as the circumstance of the reformers having repudiated, in Article 26th, on the Sacraments, that favourite expression of the Romish church, "*ex opere operato*:"—these facts serve to demonstrate that, however offensive the denial of baptismal regeneration might be to Romanists, our Protestant reformers were willing to avow their principles, in the utter rejection of such an unscriptural dogma, and at all hazards, for the truth's sake, to incur their direful anathemas.†

#### ELIZABETH. 1558—1603.

The forty-two Articles settled in Edward's reign, having been repealed by Queen Mary, a committee was appointed for their reconsideration, soon after the accession of Queen Elizabeth to the throne; and, after reducing their number from forty-two to thirty-nine, and making some inconsiderable alterations, their restoration was finally agreed upon by the Archbishops and Bishops of both Provinces, and the whole Clergy, in the Convocation holden at London in the year 1562. At this revision, the 26th of Edward's Articles, on the Sacraments, was changed in expression, though not in sentiment:‡ and in the place of the last clause of Edward's 28th Article, on Baptism, which states, that the *custom* of baptizing

\* See "*The Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent, faithfully translated into English.*" London edit. 4to. 1687, p. 35.

† This one *Historical Fact* is of immense importance in all discussions affecting the spirituality of the Baptismal Services of the Reformed English Church.—*Words and sentences*, in the lapse of years, often suffer changes and admit of different modes of application: but it is not so with FACTS.—The English reformers denied that the Sacraments, of necessity, conferred Grace. This is a well-authenticated *Fact*. They were honest men: it is not possible, therefore, they could lend themselves to the construction of a service upon principles they avowedly rejected:—indeed, it is an act of the highest dishonour to their names to wrest their words to such a meaning.

‡ Dr. Hall, alluding to this alteration, observes, 'In all this diversity there is no real difference; for the virtue of the Sacraments being put in the worthy receiving excludes the doctrine of *opus operatum*, as formally as if it had expressly been condemned.'—See Burnet's *Exposition of Article XXV.*

young children was to be commended and retained, the clause substituted in Elizabeth's Articles, declares 'The baptism of young children is in anywise to be retained as most agreeable *with the institution of Christ.*' No alterations in Edward's Articles were made in 1562, affecting any doctrinal truth: and in 1571 these Articles were again revised, and with some verbal alterations were again ratified; and they remain, to the present day, the only authorized criteria of the faith of the English church.\* The XXXIX. Articles, in 1562, were published, as the title prefixed to them states, 'for the avoiding of diversities of opinion, and for establishing of consent touching true religion;' and the Royal Declaration, added to these Articles in 1604, on the ratification of them by King James the First, shortly after his accession to the throne, enjoins 'That no man hereafter shall either print or preach to draw the Articles aside any way, but shall submit to them in the plain and full meaning thereof, and shall not put his own sense or comment to be the meaning of the Article, but shall take it in the literal and grammatical sense.'

\* NOWELL'S CATECHISM was published in 1570 (with the full sanction of the Convocation held in 1562), and may be considered as representing the final opinions and doctrines of the church, restored and established under Elizabeth. Among other questions and answers on the Sacraments, are the following:—

'MASTER. Tell me what is a Sacrament?

'SCHOLAR. It is an *outward testifying* of God's good-will and bountifulness towards us, through Christ, by a *visible sign* representing an invisible and spiritual grace; by which, the promises of God, touching the forgiveness of sin and eternal salvation given through Christ, are, as it were, sealed: and the truth of them is more certainly *confirmed* in our hearts.

'MA. Thou saidst before that a sacrament consisteth of two parts—the outward sign and inward grace—What is the outward sign in Baptism?

'SCH. Water—wherein the person is dipped, or sprinkled with it, in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost.

'MA. What is the secret and spiritual grace?

'SCH. It is of two sorts—that is—*Forgiveness of Sins*, and *Regeneration*—both of which, in the same outward sign, have their full and express *resemblance*.

'MA. How so?

'SCH. First, as the uncleannesses of the body are washed away with water, so the spots of the soul are washed away by *forgiveness* of sins:—Secondly, the beginning of *regeneration*, that is, the mortifying of our nature, is expressed by dipping in the water, or by sprinkling of it. Finally, when we, by-and-bye, rise up again out of the water, under which we be for a short time, the new life, which is the other part and end of our regeneration, is thereby *represented*.

'MA. Do we not then obtain *forgiveness of sins* by the outward washing or sprinkling of the water?

'SCH. No. For only Christ hath, with his blood, washed and clean washed away the spots of our souls. This honour therefore it is unlawful to give to the outward element:—but the Holy Ghost, as it were, sprinkling our consciences with that holy blood—wiping away all the spots of sin—makes us clean before God. Of this cleansing of our sins, we have a seal and pledge in the Sacrament.—(*Fathers of the English Church*, Vol. 8, pp. 122—126.)

This Catechism, we may observe, gives the same definition of a sacrament as the Articles of Edward and Elizabeth, (*viz.*) 'as a *visible sign*, representing 'an invisible and spiritual grace,' &c.; and declares Baptism to be 'the *resemblance* of forgiveness of sins and regeneration;'—distinctly *denying* 'that we obtain forgiveness of sins, by the outward washing.'

The following observations are just and seasonable. 'The Articles are the sheet-anchor of our churchmanship. That there is any real discrepancy between the Liturgy and Articles, I do not see, and do not believe; but the Liturgy is and must be somewhat indefinite, as a formal expression of a creed. . . . Of what use were the Articles meant to be, if not to act as the final summary of the theology of the Church of England? In the Liturgy undoubtedly some things had been taken *from*, and some things had been derived *through*, the church of Rome: and why not? A pearl is a pearl still, though found in a rotten shell. But lest there should be supposed to be any papal sentiment retained in the Liturgy, the Articles were made definitive. We honestly give in our allegiance to the church as understanding the Liturgy, yea and all her other Formularies, in the sense of the Articles. Here is their peculiar property and office. It is the office of the *Homilies* to instruct in the details of doctrine and duty. It is the office of the *Liturgy* to aid us in devotional exercises. It is the office of the *Articles* to give a general and exponential face and title to the entire theology of the Church of England.'\*

From the foregoing considerations, the present standing of the Reformed English Church, in reference to the much and long agitated question of Baptismal Regeneration, is apparent. In the earlier period of the Reformation, when Protestantism and Popery divided the matter between them, it is an admitted fact, 'That under Henry's Articles, the church did hold the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration, though even then, in the case of adults, the inward and spiritual grace seems not to have been considered as *invariably* conferred by the outward and visible sign:' and, in the different revisions of the Liturgy, after that period, there was, no doubt, a studied endeavour, on the part of our reformers, to make as little alteration in any of her services, from the Roman missal, *as was consistent with essential truth*; but it is equally obvious, from the historical facts detailed, 'That as the light of truth shone brighter and brighter upon our land, and as the reformers themselves became more and more advanced in the light and liberty of gospel-truth, they were led *wholly* to abandon the popish notion of baptismal regeneration, and finally, after many revisals, to draw up and settle the present XXXIX. Articles, constituting the basis of our ecclesiastical establishment, as *decidedly opposed to such an error*.' Nothing can express this fact more clearly than the writings of our martyred reformers themselves. The works of Frith, Bradford, Tyndall, Latimer, Hooper, and others of 'the noble army of martyrs,' are decisive on this point. They all speak distinctly and boldly against the popish view of baptismal regeneration, and the testimony of enemies, in the Council of Trent, proves the same fact;† though it must be confessed, that many great and godly men

\* Yorke's *Letter to the Bishop of London*, on his Lordship's late charge.

† In 1562, the year in which the XXXIX. Articles were settled in convocation, Bishop Jewell published "The Apology for the Church of England," under the sanction of Queen Elizabeth; and from 1564 to 1567 (that is, immediately after the Council of Trent) he was engaged in controversy with



after the settling of the Articles in 1562, have, from time to time, arisen in our church, and have uttered sentiments on the Sacraments, especially on Baptism, at variance with the Articles: and in doing so, they have often furnished weapons in support of doctrines wholly unlike those *substantially* adopted by themselves.—Such circumstances are indeed to be greatly lamented; but to any one acquainted with the tendency of the human heart, in all ages and under all forms, to substitute the outward sign for the inward grace, as well as the desire often found, even in the minds of good men, to honour the seals of the Christian covenant above the ends for which they were ordained by Christ himself, it is no wonder that the strong language of Faith and Hope and Charity pervading the services of our church, should have been misunderstood and made subservient to sentiments wholly foreign to her principles.\* It should be borne in mind, however, the church of England is not

---

Thomas Harding, a popish priest—the renowned champion of the Romish church—in Defence of his Apology. One of the objections raised by Harding against the Protestants, in his day, was this: ‘As ye acknowledge few sacraments, so ye speak of them very slenderly. Baptism (ye say) is a Sacrament of the Remission of Sins, and of that washing which we have in the blood of Christ.—Now whereas ye mean, as within few lines ye declare, by the name of a sacrament, no more but a token or sign;—specially sith ye teach in your Articles that Baptism, at the best, is but a SIGN and SEAL of our new birth, ye seem not to attribute to baptism so much as the Scripture doth.—Neither is baptism only a sign or token, that sins be remitted, but we believe, as the Catholic church, according to the Scriptures, teacheth, that in and by baptism, sins be fully and truly remitted and put away:—and that, not through the faith only of the giver or receiver, or of any other (though hereunto it be necessary in those that be come to age of discretion): but through the power and virtue of the sacrament and God’s promise.’—Bishop Jewell in his reply, denies that he asserts the sacraments to be ONLY signs and tokens.—Harding’s objection, however, remains on record, a further collateral testimony as to the views taken by the papists of the sentiments advanced in our Articles, on the Sacrament of Baptism, at the very time of their first publication; and wherein they differed from the church of Rome, on the subject of baptismal regeneration.—Jewell’s *Defence of the Apology*, folio edit., 1609, p. 217.

\* In a pamphlet, published by Seeleys in 1826, entitled, “An Affectionate Address to the Members of the Church of England, in which the most popular Arguments for Separation are considered and refuted, by the Rev. Thomas Brock, M.A., Rector of St. Peter-du-Bois, Guernsey,” the following remark occurs:—‘It may be right to state that an eminent scholar of Geneva, now a pious minister of our church, assured me, not long since, that, when pursuing his studies in that city, he met, in one of the public libraries there, with a printed correspondence in Latin, between Calvin and Cranmer, &c., in which Calvin, with a sort of prophetic discernment, tells the Archbishop, that, though he well understood his meaning, in declaring, in the office of Baptism, the infant to be regenerate, he might be assured that the time would come when that expression would be misconceived, and received as implying that baptism absolutely conveyed regeneration. Cranmer replies that it is not possible such a construction can be put upon the passage: the church having sufficiently explained her meaning in the Articles and elsewhere. I give the purport of what was told me, without binding myself to the very expressions. I build no argument upon this—I merely state the fact as I received it, with a view to inquiry being made into the subject. The discovery of such a correspondence, of the existence of which I entertain no doubt, would, at once, settle all controversies upon this point, by enabling us to come at the very mind of the framers of our Liturgy.’



what this or that man says of her: she is really *what her XXXIX. Articles express, and nothing else.* These alone are her credentials, the essence and substance of the church's theology.

It was the blessed privilege of Protestant England to have the ground-work of her ecclesiastical constitution laid in the time of good King Edward, by men who did 'resist unto blood for the faith once delivered to the saints;' and it was her further privilege to have that constitution matured and fully settled in the days of Elizabeth, of happy memory, by men, whose views of heavenly truth had been ripened by the fires of persecution which they had witnessed around them,\* and who came forth from those scenes, armed in the panoply of God, prepared for the work of the Protestant Reformation, and purged from the alloy of papal error on the great question of baptismal regeneration. The historical facts adduced, as well as the authorized documents referred to, alike demonstrate this truth. The position therefore in which our reformers left the English church, and in which King James afterwards recognized and confirmed it, is clear:—**HER ARTICLES WERE TO BE HER SOLE INTERPRETERS.** Consistency required that her Homilies and all her Liturgical Services should unite with them in sentiment and construction. Any other conclusion must involve the founders of our church in the charge of ignorance, or something worse. If, therefore, at any time 'a sense or comment' be attempted to be imposed upon her formularies, either by printing or by preaching, in any shape varying from the 'literal and grammatical' meaning of the Articles of the church, it is the bounden duty of her faithful children to reject it utterly, without stopping for a moment to inquire whence that comment comes. The Royal Declaration is positive: That no man (however high, either in ecclesiastical or civil authority,—that no man) 'hereafter shall print or preach, so 'as to draw the Articles aside *any way* from their plain and full 'meaning, . . . . in the literal and grammatical sense.'

Such is the peculiar privilege which the church of England has assumed to herself, and in every season of peril, *whether from without or from within*, it is of the highest possible importance, that all the friends of the Protestant British Constitution—**DISSENTERS AS WELL AS CHURCHMEN**†—should be willing to come forth and vindicate this prerogative; assured, as they may well be, that any infraction here would be the triumph of those evil spirits which are

---

\* Fox mentions that Archbishop Parker, the first primate in the reign of Queen Elizabeth, born at Norwich in 1504, was himself an eyewitness of Bilney's martyrdom in that city, in 1531; Parker also supplied Fox with the particulars of Bilney's sufferings.

† It is an interesting fact, that Bishop Reynolds, at the time when he was in the ranks of non-conformity, burst forth into this warm eulogy of the Articles of the English Church—'O how are we bound to praise God and 'recount with all honour, the memory of those worthies who compiled our 'Articles, which *serve as a hedge* to keep out this impious and mortiferous 'doctrine (as Fulgentius calls it) from the church of England:—and suffers 'not Pelagius to return into his own country.'—See Reynolds on "The Sinfulness of Sin," 4to. edition, 1634, p. 204. He was consecrated Bishop of Norwich in 1660.

now brooding over the nations of the earth; and that infidelity, lawlessness and popery, with their united force, would soon break down all other barriers; and the true church of Christ, *under all its forms through Christendom*, would be left to bewail the loss of the guardianship and tenderness of a nursing mother, for the iron bondage of a persecuting tyrant.

It may be urged that these anticipations are groundless. The reply is,—The temper of the times is threatening—all ancient institutions are tottering—and no device for bringing desolation upon our Zion could be better framed than that of holding up to the world the *imaginary* incongruities or inconsistencies of her component parts, to the grief of friends and the scorn of adversaries: thus actually drawing arrows from her own quiver, to wound her own breast and to hasten her own destruction; for, ‘if a house be divided against itself, that house cannot stand.’ (Mark iii. 25.)

’Tis true, the very act of ‘drawing aside’ the Articles of the church, and forcing them to speak another language than their ‘literal and grammatical sense’ will bear, to suit perhaps peculiar views of the Liturgical Services,—I say, ’tis true that such an act constitutes a high offence *against the integrity of the British Constitution in Church and State*, and especially against the spirit, as well as against the *letter*, of that Royal Declaration with which the wisdom of our forefathers has seen fit to fence the Articles;—and well may it be deemed a high offence, for the consequences attendant in its train are most disastrous.—Only once admit within the bosom of the church the liberty of interpreting her Articles by any other rule than that which she has herself defined, and everything will immediately be cast upon the troubled waters of doubtful uncertainty: yea, under such a process of arbitrary interpretation, the plainest truths, though written as with a sunbeam, will all mean nothing.

† No Protestant should forget, that *justification by faith alone* was the field on which the battle of the Reformation was fought. Luther calls this truth ‘*The Articulus stantis vel cadentis Ecclesiæ*:’—such it is: and it becomes every one acquainted with the history of our Articles, in their original construction as well as in their present form, to inquire—‘Whether the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration, spoken of in our days as supported by *the Formularies* rather than by *the Articles* of the Established Church, does not ‘savour much of Rome?’ The perfect unanimity which prevailed among the Romanists at Trent, in passing sentence of condemnation upon our reformers, *because they denied that the sacraments conferred grace*, ought not to be forgotten. Truly, in these days of increasing attachment to Rome, and of childish fondness for the revival of the circumstantialia of religion, the great life-giving truth of Christianity, in the support of which our forefathers were led to the stake, is now in danger of being tarnished and neutralized, if not forgotten and destroyed.

Ill do we deserve, therefore, the name of ‘Sons of the Reformation,’ if we be unwilling to maintain that holy ground which the English reformers once rescued from the hands of papal antichrist.

Every approach of an enemy upon the sacred territories of our church, must be watchfully observed, and the trumpet of alarm sounded. not only from her mitred battlements, but also from the meanest dwelling of her humblest priest.—Otherwise, “Ichabod—The glory is departed!” may well be written upon all our institutions—upon all our wealth—and upon all our earthly possessions—

Quis talia fando,  
Temperet a lachrymis?

## Baptismal Services.

### DIFFERENT USES OF THE TERM REGENERATION EXPLAINED.

The first use of the term Regeneration is SPIRITUAL,—that is, AS  
CONNECTED WITH THE FULLEST INTERNAL BLESSEDNESS.

IN this sense, it is presumed, by the term *Regeneration*, the English reformers intended to express that ‘*inward and spiritual grace*,’ which the church in her Catechism calls, ‘*A DEATH unto sin and a NEW BIRTH unto righteousness, for being by nature born in sin and the children of wrath, WE ARE HEREBY (that is, by this death unto sin and this new birth unto righteousness—we are hereby) made the children of grace*:’—and indeed, if the church did not pronounce the baptized person to be regenerate, we should be obliged, in some sense or other, on Scripture grounds, to believe him to be so, *until he gave evidence to the contrary*; and that for this plain reason, (a reason, perhaps, not sufficiently adverted to),—namely, *that none have a right to the ordinance of Baptism but the children of God*:\*—So that if it were given us to read the heart, and to discover that

\* The church, in the baptism of infants, receives and deals with them as *believers*.—The martyr PHILPOT observes: ‘*Children are accounted of Christ in the Gospel among the number of such as believe, as it appeareth by these words—He that offendeth one of these little babes which believe in me, it were better for him to have a mill-stone tied about his neck, and to be cast into the bottom of the sea. (Matt. xviii. 6.)—Where plainly Christ calleth such as be not able to confess their faith believers, because of his mere grace he reputeth them for believers.*’—And he adds, ‘*All such are to be baptized, as whom God acknowledgeth for his people, and voucheth them worthy of sanctification or remission of their sins.*—Therefore, since that infants be in the number or scroll of God’s people, and be partakers of the promise, by their purification in Christ, it must needs follow thereby that *they ought to be baptized*, as well as those that can profess their faith: for *we judge the people of God as well by the free and liberal promise of God, as by the confession of faith.*’ (See Philpot’s *Examinations and Writings*—Parker’s ed. pp. 274, 275.)—Hence it is clear, the reformers regarded infants as believers,—a fact which will serve to throw much light upon the principles, on which the Service for Infant Baptism was constructed.



the candidate for baptism, neither is nor ever will be the child of God, and therefore that he is and ever will continue *unregenerate*, we should not be justified in administering the outward right to him at all. It follows therefore that every church, in admitting candidates to baptism, MUST GO ON THE CHARITABLE GROUND (for no church can read the heart) that such candidates either *are* or that they *will* grow up in a state of grace with God; and ON THIS PRESUMPTION SHE HYPOTHETICALLY (that is, on the supposition that things are so) PRONOUNCES THEM REGENERATE. In the case of the baptism of those of riper years, all this is clear, for repentance and faith are openly confessed: and in infant baptism, the church, traversing the space between infancy and manhood, in the spirit of '*faith, and hope, and charity*,' throws her eye forward, and sees the child arrived at years of discretion, 'renewing the solemn vow made in his name at baptism'—hears him ratifying and confirming the same 'in his own person; and 'acknowledging himself bound to believe and to do all those things 'which his godfathers and godmothers then undertook for him,' and, IN THE ANTICIPATION of such a blessed consummation, declares him to be regenerate.

And truly, were it possible for the church to foresee that the child would grow up in rebellion against his God and Saviour,—that he would despise his invitations and trample upon his laws,—in a word, that he would live and die in impenitence and sin,—in such a case, would the church conceive that he had ever been regenerate? No. She would declare 'he had not received baptism rightly'—that all his professions had been hollow and hypocritical—that 'his circumcision was become uncircumcision'—that his baptism was no baptism—and therefore, like Simon Magus, that he was yet 'in the gall of bitterness and bond of iniquity.'

That such is the real meaning of the church appears from the pains she takes to obtain a profession of faith and repentance, and obedience from *all* her candidates for baptism. Those of riper years distinctly avow all this *in their own name* in the presence of their chosen witnesses, and in the face of the whole congregation; and, in the case of infant baptism, this profession is obtained, *through the sponsors*; but if regeneration was *adjoined* to the outward rite of baptism, as an inevitable result, all this would be useless.—After offering up a prayer to God that it may please him 'to give his 'Holy Spirit to this infant, that he may be born again,' the church proceeds to *ask the infant, through his sponsors,\** 'Dost THOU re-

\* The use of sponsors in the primitive church was so early, that the precise period of their introduction is unknown—certainly before the year 150. The sponsors promise nothing *in their own name*, but everything *in the name of the child they represent*.—Sponsorship for minors is adopted also, at this day, in civil as well as in ecclesiastical matters. For instance—when an infant king is inaugurated, a sponsor or representative is deputed to make promises, and to take the usual oaths of investiture: and when the infant king attains the legal age, he is entitled to the kingdom only on the ground of the solemn engagements made—*in his name—by his sureties or representatives—at a time when, by reason of his tender age, he could not perform them*—but which oaths and promises, when he does come of age, HIMSELF IS BOUND TO PERFORM—otherwise, HE FORFEITS THE KINGDOM.



'nounce the devil and all his works, &c.? Dost THOU believe in God the Father Almighty, &c.? Wilt THOU be baptized in this faith? Wilt THOU then obediently keep God's holy will, &c.?'—And it is only upon receiving satisfactory answers to these questions, *in the infant's name*, that the church ventures to baptize the child, and to thank God '*That it hath pleased Him to regenerate this infant* (not by baptism, but) *with His Holy Spirit*.'—Clearly, the church, in this introductory process of baptismal interrogatories, exacts all the evidence that can be procured in such a case, *that the child actually is, as it were, in a state of grace and favour with God*. She regards the conditions as already fulfilled, before she thinks herself justified in administering the outward rite.

Let the matter, therefore, be put to this short issue. Suppose that the sponsors absolutely refused to answer for the child, and to give the desired evidence as to his meetness for baptism—would the minister, in that case, be authorized to proceed and baptize the infant? Assuredly not. But why not proceed, if, in the mind of the church, baptism virtually conferred regeneration?—or if she thought the child regenerate *irrespective* of a disposition to 'receive baptism rightly,'—*irrespective* of his future faith and repentance? This appears to be decisive as to the meaning of the church, in the Baptismal Service.

The language of the Church Catechism also speaks the same fact. Hear what it says:—

'Q. What is required of persons to be baptized?

'A. *Repentance* whereby they forsake sin, and *Faith* whereby they stedfastly believe the promises of God made to them in that sacrament.

'Q. Why then are infants baptized, when, by reason of their tender age, they cannot perform them?

'A. Because they promise them *both* (meaning both repentance and faith) by their sureties, which promise, when they come to age, *themselves are bound to perform*.'

But it may be asked—Why are infants bound to perform this promise if they can attain regeneration (that is '*a death unto sin and a new birth unto righteousness*') without faith and repentance? And if they cannot, then it follows, that our church never could mean to declare the infant regenerate *independently of, or without respect to, future faith and repentance*.

All this incontrovertibly proves, that the reformed English church, in pronouncing the sentence of regeneration, goes all along on the *charitable supposition that the promise of repentance and faith will be fulfilled*. She speaks hypothetically and by anticipation. On no other ground would she allow baptism to be administered, or affirm the baptized person to be '*a child of grace*.'

In the Office for the Private Baptism of Children, the church declares the infant to be regenerate without the engagement of sponsors, and the reason is *that the child is not expected to live*,\* and

\* The Office for "*Private Baptism of Children, in Houses*," is obviously a peculiar service, prepared for a pressing exigency, and intended to do all that

God is supposed in this case to work *extraordinarily*, through His sanctifying Spirit, that change which, in the infant destined to live, He only works *ordinarily* through the exercise of repentance and faith: for the church, it should be observed, commands the infant, if he live, to be brought to be received 'into the congregation of Christ's flock;' and then he is made, by his sponsors, to promise both repentance and faith—a striking proof, that she deems them necessary in *those infants, whom God has appointed to live to years of discretion*, in order to authorize the declaration of their being regenerate.

The Sacrament of Baptism, it should be remembered, is the public and open recognition of those who are presumed *already privately and secretly* to belong to the church of Christ: and in the same way as a person who has enlisted into Her Majesty's service, is really a soldier before ever he takes the military oath, although he may be said to be *made a soldier*, when he has taken the oath of allegiance: and in the same way as an English monarch is really king, before he has taken the oath at his coronation, although he may be said to be '*made a king*,' when he is crowned and sworn;—just so a real believer is truly 'a member of Christ 'the child of God, and an inheritor of the kingdom of heaven, BEFORE HE IS BAPTIZED, though he may be said to be '*made such*,' when he is admitted into the visible church of Christ, and *publicly* signed and sealed, owned and declared to be such, in the appointed Ordinance of Baptism.

But for the purpose of showing, distinctly, that *the judgment of charity* was the ground-work on which the Baptismal Services of the reformed English church were originally founded, it may not be unsuitable, in this place, to introduce the views and sentiments, on the Sacrament of Baptism, held by two prelates of the English church, distinguished in their day—both of whom closed their lives *within the first century* after the settlement of the XXXIX. Articles in Convocation in 1562.

can be done, and to afford all the comfort that circumstances can admit of, to the weeping friends of the dying infant:—but if it should so happen that there is no time to administer the rite to the dying infant of a Christian parent, it is not apprehended that the safety of the child is compromised by such an omission.—The pious JOSEPH HALL, who died Bishop of Norwich in 1656, speaks thus: 'That the contempt of Baptism damneth is past all doubt: 'but that the constrained absence thereof should send infants to hell, is a cruel rashness.—It is not their sin to die early. . . . Because they 'could not live awhile longer, that therefore they should die everlastingly, is 'the hard sentence of a bloody religion.'—And he adds, 'Baptism without faith cannot save a man, and by faith doth save him: and faith without baptism where it cannot be had (*not where it may be had and is contemned*) may 'save him.—That Spirit which works *by means*, will not be tied to means.'—(Hall's *Select Works*, Vol. 4, pp. 236, 237.)

CARLETON,\*

Bishop of Chichester, published a work, in 1626, (about two years before his death,) called "An Examination of those Things wherein the Author of *the late Appeal*† holdeth the Doctrines of the Pelagians and Arminians to be the Doctrines of the Church of England;"—and, in this work, the bishop strongly asserts the CHARITY of our Baptismal Services and Homilies, in denominating baptized persons regenerate or justified, as nothing more than *the Charity of the Ancient Church*.—The Appeal raises some subtle questions or '*quirkes*' (as they are called) as to falling from grace after baptism, and to these the bishop thus replies:—"If our author had been pleased to have observed the judgment of the ancients, he would not be thus troubled with *novelties*.—This one poor objection seemeth to trouble the man.—St. Augustine might easily have satisfied him: for *he observeth a great difference between them that are regenerate and justified only SACRAMENTO TENUS, and those that are regenerate and justified according to the purpose of God's election. Abraham received the sacrament of circumcision as a seal of the righteousness of faith:—the sacrament is good to them to whom it is a seal of the righteousness of faith, but it is not a seal in all that receive the sacrament. For many receive the sign, which have not the thing. Then to proceed, Ishmael was circumcised and so was Isaac: but Ishmael was born according to the flesh, and Isaac according to the Spirit. Now he that was born according to the flesh was not justified, but only *sacramento tenus*; but he that was born according to the Spirit was justified truly. St. Augustine saith, *Cum essent omnibus communia Sacramenta, non communis erat omnibus Gratia, &c.* (see August. in Psalm lxxvii.) . . . . . Israel was called to be a people of God, yet all that were so called were not so in truth; so all that receive baptism are called '*the children of God—regenerate—justified*'—for to us they must be taken for such, IN CHARITY, UNTIL THEY SHEW THEMSELVES OTHER.—But the author affirmeth, *that this is not left to men's charity, as you (saith he) do inform the world; because we are taught in the Service-Book of our church, earnestly to believe, that Christ hath favourably received these infants that are baptized—that He hath embraced them with the arms of His mercy—that He**

---

\* Carleton was chosen with Davenant, to represent the English church, at the Synod of Dort, in 1618.

† This Appeal was dedicated to King Charles the First, under the title of "An Appeal to Cæsar," and was answered by Bishop Carleton, the king's chaplain.—In the Epistle Dedicatory to the King, the bishop remarks: "Two . . . great dangers have assailed your kingdom of late—the PLAGUE and the PELAGIAN HERESY—the one destroying bodies, the other souls.—This latter hath been creeping in corners heretofore, but of late hath come in more public show than ever before, and dedicated to your Majesty, in a book, entitled '*An Appeal to Cæsar*,' wherein the author hath, with confidence, delivered the doctrines of the Pelagians and Arminians for the doctrines of the church of England.—By this, our dangers grow great, and come near us."



*hath given unto them the blessing of everlasting life—and that, out of that belief and persuasion, we are to give thanks faithfully and devoutly for it.*—The bishop replies: ‘All this we receive and make no doubt of, but, when we have said all, we must come to this, that all this is nothing but THE CHARITY OF THE CHURCH, and what more can you make of it?—For where he (meaning the author of the Appeal) urgeth this—‘That children baptized are put in the state of salvation, and this must be believed’—I make no doubt of it; but because he seemeth to have a *strange understanding* of it, and urgeth it as if, forsooth, it could not be answered, I ask him this question—Whether we must believe it as *an article of FAITH*, or *ex judicio CHARITATIS*?—This judgment of charity he utterly rejecteth; then he must hold that we believe it as an article of faith:—but this is not contained in any article of faith—it is not expressed in any Scripture, and the things which a man is bound to believe for his salvation (to speak properly) he must believe for himself only; not for another man. . . . This proveth evidently, that this believing, whereof our Communion Book speaketh, is nothing else but to believe it *EX JUDICIO CHARITATIS*, and can no further be stretched.—Concerning this *judgment of charity*, WE do not inform the world any otherwise than St. Augustine informed the church *long since*, against the Pelagians. The Pelagians urged these things, as you do, ‘That they that were baptized were regenerate and justified.’—St. Augustine answereth, *They are so, for aught that we know; and until they themselves show themselves to the contrary*:—then, so long as we have no cause to the contrary, we judge them *in charity* to be such as we desire they should be.—Did WE devise this? or did WE first inform the world of this?—IT HATH BEEN OF OLD RECEIVED THUS IN THE CHURCH.—WE do but say that which THE ANCIENT FATHERS have said before us; and YOU follow that which your fathers, the Pelagians, have taught before you:—but here is great difference—WE, following the ancient fathers, follow THE CHURCH—and YOU, FOLLOWING THE PELAGIANS, FOLLOW THE ENEMIES OF THE CHURCH.’—(See London edit. 4to. 1626, pp. 96—99.)

### U S H E R,

who was Archbishop of Armagh for thirty years, and died in 1656, was the author of a work entitled, “A Body of Divinity, or the Sum and Substance of Christian Religion, catechistically propounded and explained, by way of Question and Answer.” The following questions and answers are taken from that part which treats on the Sacrament of Baptism.

‘Q. Doth the inward grace *always accompany* the outward sign in those of years baptized?’

‘A. NO—but only then when the profession of their faith is not outward only and counterfeit, but sincere and hearty—they laying hold on Christ offered in the sacrament *by a lively faith*, which is the hand to receive the mercies offered. Acts viii. 37: ‘If thou



*believest with all thy heart thou mayst be baptized,*' saith Philip to the eunuch.—For it were absurd to extend the benefit of the seal beyond the covenant.—Now the covenant is made only in the faithful. John i. 12; Mark xvi. 16: *'He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved; but he that believeth not (whether he be baptized or no) shall be condemned.'*—Simon Magus (Acts viii. 13) and Julian, and thousands of hypocrites and formalists, shall find no help, *in the day of the Lord*, by the holy water of their baptism, without it be to increase their judgment.

'Q. But what say you of *Infants* baptized, that are born in the church?—doth the inward grace in their baptism always attend upon the outward sign?

'A. SURELY NO.—The Sacrament of Baptism is effectual in infants, only to those (and to all those) who belong unto the election of grace. Which thing, though we, *IN THE JUDGMENT OF CHARITY*, do judge of every particular infant: yet we have no ground to judge so *of all in general*; or, if we should judge so, yet it is *NOT ANY JUDGMENT OF CERTAINTY—WE MAY BE MISTAKEN.*

'Q. What is to be thought of the effect of baptism in those elect infants, whom God hath appointed to live to years of discretion?

'A. In them we have no warrant to promise constantly and extraordinary work, to whom God intends to afford ordinary means. For though God do sometimes sanctify from the womb, as in Jeremy and John Baptist—sometime in baptism, as he pleaseth—yet it is hard to affirm, as some do, that every elect infant doth ordinarily, before or in baptism, receive *INITIAL REGENERATION, and the seed of faith and grace.* For if there were such a habit of grace then infused, it could not be so utterly lost or secreted, as never to show itself but by being attained by new instruction:—*But we may rather deem and judge, that Baptism is not actually effectual to justify and sanctify, until the party do believe and embrace the promises.*

'Q. Is not baptism then, for the most part, a vain, empty show—consisting of shadows without the substance, and a sign without the thing signified?

'A. No.—It is always an *effectual seal* to all those that are heirs of the covenant of grace. The promises of God touching justification, remission, adoption, are *made and sealed* in baptism to every elect child of God, *then to be actually enjoyed when the party baptized shall actually lay hold upon them by faith.* Thus baptism to every elect infant is a seal of the righteousness of Christ, *to be extraordinarily applied by the Holy Ghost, if it die in its infancy—to be apprehended by faith, if it live to years of discretion.*—So that as baptism administered to those of years is not effectual unless they believe; so we can make no comfortable use of our baptism, administered in our infancy, *until we believe.* The righteousness of Christ and all the promises of grace were in my baptism estated upon me, and sealed up unto me, on God's part: but then, *I come to have the profit and benefit of them, when I come to understand*

‘*what grant God, in baptism, hath sealed unto me, and actually to lay hold upon it by faith.*

‘Q. Can you explain this more clearly?

‘A. We know that an estate may be made unto an infant, and in his infancy he hath right unto it, though not actual possession of it until such years. Now the time of the child’s incapability, the use and comfort of this estate is lost indeed: but the right and title is not vain and empty, but true and real; and stands firmly secured unto the child *to be claimed what time soever he is capable of it*:—even so infants-elect have Christ and all His benefits sealed up unto them, in the Sacrament of Baptism:—yet through their incapableness, they have not actual fruition of them, until God give them actual faith to apprehend them. Is baptism lost then, which is administered in our infancy—was it a vain and an empty ceremony? No. It was a complete and effectual sacrament; and God’s invisible graces were *truly sealed up under visible signs*. And though the use and the comfort of baptism be not for the present enjoyed by the infant: yet by the parent it is, who believes God’s promises for himself and for his seed, and so by the whole congregation, and the things then done shall be actually effectual to the infant, whenever it shall be capable to make use of them.

‘Q. But is baptism of *absolute necessity* to salvation?

‘A. Baptism is a high ordinance of God and a means whereby He hath appointed to communicate Christ and His benefits to our souls; and therefore not to be neglected or slightly esteemed, but used with all reverence and thankful devotion, *when it may be had*:—yet, where God denieth it, either in regard of shortness of the infant’s life, or by any other unavoidable necessity, there comes no danger from the want of the sacraments, but only from the contempt of them.’—(See London edit. 4to. 1702, pp. 367—370.)

Such were the sentiments of the learned and laborious Usher, on the Sacrament of Baptism, and such his testimony as to the *spiritual* application of the term *regeneration*, in the Baptismal Services of the Church.

---

The second use of the term Regeneration is SACRAMENTAL,—that is,  
AS THE SIGN PUT FOR THE THING SIGNIFIED.

In the language of Scripture, as well as in common conversation, the sign or figure of a thing is frequently put for the thing itself. For instance—The figure of brass, representing a serpent, is called ‘*the serpent*,’ (Numbers xxi. 8; John iii. 14); and the sacramental signs of Christ’s body and blood are called by Christ himself, ‘*This is my body!—This is my blood!*’ (Matt. xxvi. 26, 28.) The figure or picture also of an object is not unfrequently called by the name of the very thing represented. The Christian fathers, as well as the English reformers, were much in the habit of using promiscuously the name of the sign and the thing signified.\*

\* See Dr. Houston’s Treatise on Christian Baptism—pp. 25;

The English martyr FRITH, speaking on this point, observes, 'The Scripture useth to speak of the *outward baptism* as though it were the *inward*, that is to say, the spirit of God; and therefore St. Paul saith, *That we are buried with Christ through baptism.* (Col. ii. 12.) And yet, as St. Augustine expoundeth it, the outward baptism doth but *signify* this burial. This place shall expound all the old doctors which seem contrary to our *sentence* (sentiment), *and therefore mark it well.*'—(See Russell's *English Reformation*, Frith, Vol. 3. p. 290.)

The martyr HOOPER also tells us, 'To speak *sacramentally* is to give the name of the thing to the sign. . . . The fathers thought it right to name the sacrament by the name of the thing that was represented by the sacrament: yet, in many places of their writings, they so interpret themselves that no man, except he be wilfully blind, can say, but they understood the sacraments to signify, and not to be the thing signified.'—(See Extracts from Hooper.)

And Bishop JEWELL remarks, 'We must consider that the learned fathers, in their Treaties (Treatises) on the Sacraments, sometimes use the outward sign for the thing signified—sometimes the thing signified instead of the sign. . . . This figure is called *metonymia*,—that is, an exchange of names,—and is much used among the learned, especially speaking of the sacraments.\*'—(See Jewell's *Defence of the Apology*, folio edit. 1609, p. 218.)

Hence it is that baptism has not improperly been called *Regeneration* or *New Birth*, though only the figure or picture, or, as the 27th Article calls it, '*The Sign of Regeneration or New Birth.*' And to confirm this fact we may adduce the testimony of Doddridge and Baxter, who will not be suspected of any undue partiality to the Baptismal Services of the Church of England. Doddridge observes, 'As in the earliest days of the primitive church, persons being brought to embrace Christianity were immediately baptized, the time of their baptism and that of their conversion being spoken of as one, and as the time when they were (as it were) born into a new world and joined to the family of God's children—it is no wonder that the action by which they testified that change, so lately made, should sometimes be put for that change itself:—and thus ILLUMINATI also signifies the same with baptized persons, —not that they were illuminated by baptism, but because they were generally baptized as soon as enlightened with the knowledge of Christianity.'—(See Doddridge's Works, 8vo. edition. 1804, Vol. 5. p. 322.)

And Baxter, in a general argument on the subject, without any reference to the formulary in question, thus expresses himself: 'All that the minister warrantably baptizeth, are *sacramentally regenerate* and are in *foro ecclesie* members of Christ, and children of God, and heirs of heaven:—but, it is only those that are

\* Archbishop CRANMER's views are fully stated in the extracts from his writings.



‘sincerely delivered up in covenant to God in Christ, that are *spiritually and really regenerate*, and are such as shall be owned for members of Christ and children of God, *in foro cæli*.’—(See Baxter’s *Directory*, folio edit. 1678, Vol. 3. p. 16.)

From these considerations, we gather, how it is that baptism may not improperly be called *Regeneration or New Birth*, although meaning only what the Article denominates the *Sign of Regeneration or New Birth*:—and precisely upon the same ground it is, that baptism may be called ‘*The Remission of Sins*,’—not that the sins of any are really washed away by baptism; but because baptism is the sign or seal of this heavenly blessing. St. Peter says, ‘Repent and be baptized, every one of you, *for the remission of sins*,’ (Acts ii. 38.); and in another place, the same apostle tells us, ‘Even baptism also doth now *save us*,’ (1 Peter iii. 21.) Ananias also thus addresses St. Paul, ‘Arise and be baptized and *wash away thy sins*,’\* (Acts xxii. 16.); and in the Nicene Creed we acknowledge ‘One Baptism for the Remission of Sins,’—not that baptism saves or washes away or remits sin, but because in baptism, as the 27th Article expresses it, ‘The promises of forgiveness of sin, and of our adoption to be the sons of God, by the Holy Ghost, are *visibly signed and sealed*.’ Baptism therefore becomes a *perpetual standing monument* in the church, during all ages, of the pardon of sin universally past, present, and to come,—by continually reminding us ‘That Almighty God, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ pardoneth and absolveth all them that truly repent and *unfeignedly believe the Gospel*.’† And as a corroborative testimony, we may notice that the 25th Article describes *both sacraments* to be ‘signs of grace and God’s good-will towards us:’ adding that ‘in such only as *WORTHILY* receive the *same* (meaning Baptism and the Lord’s Supper) they have a wholesome effect or

---

\* If texts of Scripture such as these be admitted in proof that the remission of sin accompanies baptism, it must next follow, as a necessary consequence, that texts of Scripture, such as ‘*This is my body*,’ ‘*This is my blood*,’ (Matt. xxvi. 26, 28), must be admitted in proof of the popish doctrine of *Transubstantiation*.—On the other hand, let it be conceded that the sign is used for the thing signified in both instances, and every difficulty will vanish.

† Bishop Jewell observes, ‘Verily to ascribe felicity or remission of sin, *which is the inward work of the Holy Ghost*, unto any manner of outward action whatsoever, it is superstitious, a gross and a Jewish error.’—(See Jewell’s *Defence of the Apology*, p. 442.)—Bishop Hooper says, ‘Such as attribute the remission of sins unto the external sign, do offend.’—And again: ‘As for those that say that circumcision and baptism be alike, and yet attribute the remission of original sin unto baptism which was never given unto circumcision, they not only destroy the similitude and equity that should be between them, but also take from Christ the remission of sin, and translate it unto the water and element of baptism.’—(See Extracts from Hooper.)—And in Dean Nowell’s *Catechism*, one of the questions asked is, ‘Do we not obtain forgiveness of sins by the outward washing or sprinkling of the water?’ To which the answer given is, ‘NO. . . . This honour it is unlawful to give to the outward element. . . . Of the cleansing of our sin we have a pledge and seal in the Sacrament.’—(See Extract from Nowell’s *Catechism*, p. 8.)



operation: but they that receive them unworthily purchase to themselves *damnation*, as St. Paul saith.\*

This concluding sentence of the 25th Article demands especial observation. It applies to *both sacraments*, that is, to *Baptism* as well as to the Lord's Supper: and if words mean anything, it overthrows, at once, the doctrine of Regeneration being invariably attendant on baptism; inasmuch as it teaches that, so far from baptism conveying absolutely regeneration, it may be actually accompanied with '*damnation*.' Baptism, however, is '*a sign of grace and God's good-will*,' and as such, the term Baptism may be used for regeneration itself *sacramentally*—that is, agreeably to the mode of speaking and writing which has prevailed in different ages of the Christian church,—the SIGN PUT FOR THE THING SIGNIFIED.

---

The third use of the term Regeneration is RELATIVE.—that is, AS  
INTRODUCTORY TO A NEW STATE OF EXTERNAL PRIVILEGES.

The visible church of Christ, in the language of Scripture, consists of all those who are professedly his disciples—all who call themselves Christians and apparently believe his Gospel—indeed, even hypocrites and those ungodly professors who secretly are under the influence of that 'carnal mind' which is 'enmity against God.'

---

\* THOMAS ROGERS, Chaplain to Archbishop Bancroft, wrote an Exposition of the XXXIX. Articles in 1607, and dedicated it to the Archbishop. The following words are printed on the title-page: 'Perused and, by the lawfull Authority of the Church of England, allowed to be publike.' On the clause referred to he makes these remarks: 'We read in Holy Scripture, that SOME persons do receive the sacraments and the things signified by the sacraments, which are the remission of sins and other spiritual graces from God; and so received was the Sacrament of Baptism of Cornelius, and the Lord's Supper of the good disciples and the godly Corinthians:—Some again receive the sacraments, but not the things by them signified; so received was Baptism of Simon Magus, and the Lord's Supper of Judas, and so receive the atheists, libertines, and impenitent persons:—AND SOME receive not the sacraments at all, and yet are partakers of the things by the sacraments signified; such a communicant was the thief upon the cross. . . . The papists therefore be in a wrong opinion which deliver that the sacraments are not only seals but also *causes of grace*, and that the sacraments do *give grace*, even because they be delivered and received *ex opere operato*.'—(London edition, 1629, pp. 159, 160.) The reference which Rogers makes to the thief upon the cross also serves to illustrate the definition of a sacrament given in the Church Catechism, as 'GENERALLY necessary to salvation,' and to confirm the declaration made by the church, in her Exhortation to Candidates for Baptism '*of riper years*,' wherein she speaks '*of the great necessity of this Sacrament* (that is, Baptism) WHERE IT MAY BE HAD.'—The same view is also given by the church, in reference to the Lord's Supper, in one of the rubrics at the end of "The Communion of the Sick," where she instructs the minister to make known to her sick member, who is possessed of true repentance, lively faith and a thankful remembrance of Christ's death; but who, through unavoidable circumstances, may be hindered in partaking of the outward elements—still, '*that he DOETH eat and drink the body and blood of our Saviour Christ*,—profitably to his soul's health, —ALTHOUGH HE DO NOT RECEIVE THE SACRAMENT WITH HIS MOUTH.'

The Scriptures are clear on this point. Christ himself compares his church to the FLOOR, in which there is chaff as well as wheat, (Matt. iii. 12)—to the FIELD, in which the tares are growing with the wheat, (Matt. xiii. 24, 30)—to the VINEYARD, in which there are murmuring, envious, and unelected labourers, (Matt. xx. 1, 11, 15, 16)—to the MARRIAGE-SUPPER of the king's son, where every guest has not on the wedding-garment, (Matt. xxii. 2, 11)—and to the VINE, in which there are unfruitful branches, fit only for burning, (John xv. 1, 2, 5, 6.)

NOAH'S ARK is also referred to in the Baptismal Service, as a type of the visible church of Christ, in which were to be found unclean as well as clean beasts, and a cursed Ham as well as a blessed Shem, (Gen. ix. 25, 26):—in a word, the Scriptures speak of men *agreeably to their profession*, and in this sense also, as well as in the language of hope and charity, the church of Christ may be *denominated, relatively, the regenerated portion of mankind.\**

The terms *Sanctify, Holy, &c.* are constantly used in Scripture to express the *relative condition* of persons, places, and things.† For instance—all the first-born are said to be 'sanctified to the Lord,' (Exod. xiii. 2.) Aaron and his sons are said to be *consecrated and sanctified* to minister unto the Lord, (Exod. xxviii. 41.) Moses was

\* The Scriptures constantly speak of men *relatively*; that is, according to their profession. The children of Israel are called '*a holy people to the Lord,*' (Deut. vii. 6; xiv. 2, 21,) though their rebellions and idolatries lamentably testify that many of them were far from *internally* holy.—They are called also *children*, though, at the same time, they are described as 'a sinful nation'—*a people laden with iniquity—a seed of evil doers—children that are corruptors.*' (Isaiah i. 2—6.)—And again: '*Among my people are found WICKED MEN.*' (Jer. v. 26.) Our Lord also speaks of 'the children of the kingdom' being 'CAST OUT into outer darkness.' (Matt. viii. 12.)—And St. Paul, alluding to the *whole nation* of Israel (infants as well as adults) in their passage through the Red Sea, says, 'They did ALL eat the same spiritual meat, and did ALL drink the same spiritual drink: for they drank of that SPIRITUAL ROCK that followed them, and THAT ROCK WAS CHRIST:' yet, in the very next verse, the apostle tells us that, 'with many of them God was not well pleased, for they were overthrown in the wilderness.' (1 Cor. x. 1—5. See also 1 Cor. xii. 13, 27 and vi. 15; Romans ix. 1—5; Gal. iii. 26, 27.)

† Bishop Bradford, who died in 1731, in "A Discourse concerning Baptismal and Spiritual Regeneration," observes, 'It is the way of the Scriptures 'to speak to and of the visible members of the church of Christ, under such appellations and expressions as may seem, at first hearing, to imply that they are all of them truly righteous and holy persons. Thus the apostles style those to whom they write, in general, *Saints*:—speak of them as *sanctified in Christ Jesus—chosen of God—buried with Christ in baptism—risen again with Him from the dead—sitting with Him in heavenly places*:—and particularly St. Paul says, they were *saved by the washing of regeneration, &c.* The reason of which is, that they were visibly by obligation and profession all this: which was thus represented to them the more effectually to stir them up and engage them to live according to their profession and obligation.'—This sermon is on the list of publications circulated by the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, and, in 1802, was printed by the Society with this remark: 'This sixth edition was published at a time when it is hoped that so judicious and scriptural a Discourse may be of service to settle the minds of good Christians, in some present disputes concerning Baptismal and Spiritual Regeneration.'

likewise commanded to *sanctify* Mount Zion; that is, to set it apart for God's appearance on it, (Exod. xix. 23.) The tabernacle also, and afterwards the temple, was *sanctified* or set apart for the worship and service of God,\* (Numbers vii. 1.)—Again, the ground on which Moses stood is called by God himself, 'holy ground,' (Exodus iii. 5.)—And passing from the Old to the New Testament, we find the terms *Sanctification and Holiness* ascribed to those who were never otherwise sanctified than *by their admission into Christ's visible church*—that is, by their *external* separation from the world, and their *outward* profession of his doctrine.—For instance, St. Paul directs his Epistles to the whole visible church at Corinth as Saints, 'To them that are sanctified in Christ Jesus and called to be saints,' (1 Cor. i. 2); and this was the common beginning of all the Apostle's Epistles:—yet we know, that there were some in this church of Corinth, who had not the knowledge of God, (1 Cor. xv. 34)—who denied the resurrection, (1 Cor. xv. 35); and others who were guilty of the most foul and flagitious crimes, for which the apostle sharply reproves them, (1 Cor. v. 1, &c.): still, he calls them all 'Saints';—*simply because they were visible church members and made a profession of the Christian faith and name.*—Again too, St. Paul, speaking of his persecuting rage, tells us, 'Many of the saints did I shut up in prison,' (Acts xxvi. 10); and who these saints were, is clear from what the apostle himself tells us, '*All that were of this way,*' (Acts ix. 2,) in other words—all who were visible church members—all who made a profession of the Christian faith and name—for, it is not to be supposed, the persecutor Saul had the gift of discerning between sincere and formal professors.—St. Paul also tells us, that 'the unbelieving husband is *sanctified* by the wife,' and that the children of a believing parent are '*holy,*' (1 Cor. vii. 14.)—The apostle St. Peter also speaks of some as *redeemed*, who yet were certainly never better than *Ecclesiastical Saints*, for it is immediately afterwards said of them, that they '*denied the Lord who bought them,*' (2 Peter ii. 1):—and indeed St. Paul speaks of some as sanctified, who are yet supposed to have sinned unpardonably, accounting '*the blood of the covenant wherewith he was sanctified an unholy thing,*' (Heb. x. 29.)—These places irrefragably prove, that, in Scripture language, those are called *Saints and Sanctified*, who were members of the church of Christ, and thereby *relatively holy*.†

---

\* The use of the word '*sanctify*,' in this sense, fully explains the petition in the Baptismal Service, '*Sanctify this water to the mystical (or emblematic) washing away of sin.*'—Wheatly remarks, 'By this is meant, not that the water contracts any new quality in its nature or essence, by such consecration; but only that it is sanctified or made holy in its use, and separated from common to sacred purposes.'

† Many of the objections raised against expressions in the Baptismal Services might be urged against the language of the Bible itself:—indeed, if the texts of Scripture just cited had been found in any of our Liturgical Services, they would have been deemed highly objectionable;—and the same might be said of other texts of Scripture. St. Paul, for instance, writing to the whole visible church at Rome (vi. 3) says, 'So many of you as were baptized into Jesus Christ, were baptized into his death:'—and, writing to the Christian



The conclusion to which the argument brings us is this,—that as there is a two-fold Sanctification and Holiness, the one external and relative, and the other internal and real,—so also is there a correspondent two-fold Regeneration:—and consequently, that our reformers were not only justified, but *were actually adopting a scriptural mode of expression*, in speaking of the baptized person as regenerate—although, at the same time, they considered him only *externally and relatively* ‘a member of Christ, the child of God and an inheritor of the kingdom of heaven,’—these terms being used to express his covenant-standing before God and the church and the world, as imparting great spiritual privileges and involving corresponding duties, inasmuch as by baptism he becomes such *outwardly*, if not inwardly—*professedly*, if not effectually.

Bishop HOPKINS, who died in 1699, thus states the subject:—  
 ‘Doubtless, so far forth baptism is a means of sanctification—as it is the solemn admission of persons into the visible church—as it separates them from the world, and from all false religions in it—and brings them out of the visible kingdom of the devil, into the visible kingdom of Jesus Christ.—For if all that are admitted into the visible church, are thereby dignified with the title of *Saints and the children of God*, then, by baptism, (which is the solemn way of admitting them into the church) they may, with very good reason, be said to be MADE SAINTS, the CHILDREN of God, and MEMBERS of Christ:—but this is only a RELATIVE SANCTITY, NOT A REAL—and many such saints and sanctified men there are, who shall never enter into heaven, but, by their wicked lives, forfeit and lose that blessed inheritance, to which they were called. . . Such a Baptismal Regeneration as this is, must needs be acknowledged by all that will not wilfully shut their eyes against the clear evidence of Scripture.’\*—(See Bp. Hopkins’ Works—Pratt’s edit. Vol. 2, p. 423.)

church at Corinth (1 Cor. xii. 13) he says, ‘By ONE SPIRIT are we *all baptized into one body* :—and again, writing to the Christian church at Galatia (iii. 26, 27) he says, ‘Ye are *all the children of God*, by faith in Christ Jesus : for ‘as many of you as have been baptized into Christ, have put on Christ.’—Clearly the apostle did not mean to say, that all the baptized persons among the Romans, the Corinthians, and the Galatians were interested *savingly* in the death of Christ, or that ‘by one Spirit’ they were all united to his mystical body ; or that they were all children of God, and had all put on Christ as their righteousness and sanctification.—The apostle evidently transfers that which belongs to the inward and spiritual grace to the outward and visible sign, or, in other words, *he speaks of the baptized in their relative condition*.

\* Doddridge, on the Greek word translated ‘regeneration’ in the authorized version of the Bible—a word which occurs only twice in the New Testament (Mat. xix. 28 ; Tit. iii. 5)—observes : ‘It is plain that the word *παλιγγενεσία* is often put for ANY GREAT CHANGE.’—(Doddridge’s Works, Vol. 5, p. 322.) And the Rev. E. Bickersteth gives his view of the judgment of the reformers in the use of the term ‘regeneration’ thus : ‘Where baptism is ‘rightly received by adults. . . Regeneration, in its fullest sense, is gratefully acknowledged to God ; . . while in the baptism of infants, . . seeing they cannot perform repentance and faith, their regeneration, in its highest sense, is necessarily only the language of faith, hope, and charity : ‘but a relative change has really taken place, . . because regeneration is used, as in the Scriptures, for a change of state, and applied to baptism,



## SUCH ARE THE DIFFERENT USES

to which the term regeneration, as it occurs in the Baptismal Services of the English church, may be applied. The first and most obvious meaning embraces the fullest extent of spiritual blessings, as connected with the covenant of grace,—and was, no doubt, the primary application of the term passing in the minds of the reformers: although the other uses, in their subordinate sense, were not intended to be excluded from due consideration.—This was the broad basis on which the Baptismal Services of the church were founded, and it is verily believed, that a fair and just appropriation of these *combined uses* of the term regeneration, will lead to the most correct views of the general bearing of those services; and, at the same time, under the Divine blessing, will help to solve many of those difficulties with which the tender consciences of many good men have been heavily oppressed.

Let it not be imagined, for a moment, that any remarks which have been offered were intended either to lower the ordinance of baptism, or the most spiritual views with which that service can be used. By no means. Baptism is an ordinance instituted by Christ himself, and cannot be despised or neglected without incurring fearful guilt. All that is asked is—*‘That the sacraments be revered with scriptural knowledge and intelligence; and not dishonoured by papal ignorance and superstition.’\**

The Catechism beautifully describes the nature of a sacrament, when she tells us that it is *‘an outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace, given unto us, ordained by Christ himself, as a means whereby we receive the same and a pledge to assure us thereof.’* The Sacrament of Baptism therefore is not a mere ceremony, as some affirm: it is far otherwise. It is A SIGN—A MEANS (not *the* means, but *one* medium or instrument, among other means)—and A PLEDGE of grace, ordained by Christ himself.—And verily, if all who devoted their offspring to the service of the Redeemer, in

‘(Titus iii. 5.)—On the profession of faith, by the sponsors, infants are, in all cases, brought by baptism into this state of grace, or into a new world of covenant-privileges promised to the children of believers, and which promises are sealed to them at that time, just as the Jews were by circumcision. —Faith in parents (Matt. xv. 28; Mark ix. 23) and sponsors and believers in general (Matt. ix. 2; Mark ii. 5; Luke v. 20) may, in their highest sense, realize these promises: but unbelief leaves the baptized children in that lower sense of the terms (the sense of covenant-privileges) children of God, regeneration, and the like, the use of which the Scriptures justify. This sense includes, as in the case of the circumcised Jew, real privileges to be grateful for, and very greatly increases our personal responsibility; but *is not necessarily joined to our personally having spiritual and eternal life.* In using the (Baptismal) Service, we may *always* be thankful for the *relative change*; and by faith, we may rise to be *grateful for the highest blessing.*’—(See *The Divine Warning*, pp. 311, 312.)

\* Bp. Jewell says, ‘The greatest abuse and villainy that can happen to any sacrament is, contrary to Christ’s institution and the nature of a sacrament, to be honoured instead of God:—as St. Augustine saith, He who receives baptism *unworthily* receives [*judicium*] not salvation.’—(See *Jewell’s Defence of his Apology*, folio edit., 1609, p. 284.)

this blessed ordinance of Christ's own appointment, and if all ministers and worshipping assemblies, in the midst of whom it was devoutly and scripturally used, *had hearts fully prepared by the Holy Ghost*, cordially to 'ask and seek and knock,' in the exercise of *strong faith*, for the great spiritual blessings expressed in the Baptismal Services of our church,\* who can tell how often, even that 'inward and spiritual grace' of which baptism is 'the outward and visible sign' (namely—'a death unto sin, and a new birth unto righteousness') might accompany its administration? Not, indeed, as the papists assert, 'ex opere operato,' but as the Article of the Protestant reformed English church affirms, 'by virtue of prayer unto God,' offered according to His will, and in an ordinance instituted by Christ himself,—and therefore in an ordinance which Christ himself will bless to all who seek him in it with repentance and faith.

'He is not a Jew which is one *outwardly*: neither is that circumcision which is outward in the flesh: but he is a Jew which is one *inwardly*: and circumcision is that of the *heart*, in the spirit and 'not in the letter; whose praise is not of men, but of God.'—(Rom. ii. 28, 29.)

## Fathers of the English Church.

### INTRODUCTORY OBSERVATION.

*It has been stated that the Christian Fathers, in speaking of the Sacraments, not unfrequently used THE SIGN FOR THE THING SIGNIFIED, and the English Reformers, who were educated and well versed in their writings, from their earliest years, contracted and no doubt, to a certain extent, adopted (some more than others) A LIKE METHOD OF EXPRESSION. The Extracts from Cranmer, Latimer, and Hooper, it is hoped, will serve both as a caution and a key to the right interpretation of this kind of language: and the testimonies adduced in the following pages, (chiefly taken from the writings of our martyred saints,) will demonstrate to every candid reader, the GROUND on which the Romish Council of Trent expressed their ENTIRE UNANIMITY IN THE CONDEMNATION OF THE REFORMERS, FOR DENYING THAT THE SACRAMENTS CONFER GRACE.'*

---

\* The Baptismal Service, it should ever be remembered, was designed for *believers in the exercise of faith*:—indeed, it is absurd and contradictory to suppose, that a service, framed for the express purpose of admitting men into a Christian church, was to be administered or participated by any but *real Christians*.

## TYNDAL,

## THE FIRST TRANSLATOR OF THE NEW TESTAMENT,

called '*The Apostle of England*,' who was strangled and burnt in 1536, in a work entitled "*A Pathway into the Holy Scripture*," speaking of the duty of love to our neighbour, writes thus:—'And to know how contrary this law is unto our nature, and how it is damnation not to have this law written in our hearts, though we never commit the deeds; and how there is no other means to be saved from this damnation than through repentance toward the law and faith in Christ's blood, *which are the very inward baptism of our souls; and the washing and the dipping of our bodies in the water is the outward sign.*'

---

In a work called "*The Obedience of a Christian Man*," Tyndal, writing on the sacraments, says:—'Forasmuch as we be come to signs, we will speak a word or two of the signs which God hath ordained, that is to say, of the sacraments which Christ left amongst us for our comfort, that we may walk in light and in truth, and in feeling of the power of God. . . . This word sacrament is as much as to say an holy sign, and *representeth alway some promise of God.* As in the Old Testament God ordained that the rainbow should represent and signify unto all men an oath that God sware unto Noah and to all men after him, that he would no more drown the world through water.'

On the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ, Tyndal observes:—'So the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ hath a promise annexed, which the priest should declare in the English tongue—*This is my body which is broken for you—This is my blood that is shed for many, unto the forgiveness of sins—This do in remembrance of me,* saith Christ (Luke xxii. and 1 Cor. xi.) If when thou seest the sacrament, or eatest his body, or drinkest his blood, thou hast this promise fast in thine heart, (that his body was slain, and his blood shed for thy sins) and believest it, *so art thou saved and justified thereby.* If not, so helpeth it thee not, though thou hearest a thousand masses in a day, or though thou doest nothing else all thy life long than eat his body or drink his blood, no more than it should help thee in a dead thirst, to behold a bush at a tavern-door, if thou knewest not thereby that there was wine within to be sold.'

And on the Sacrament of Baptism, this reformer writes thus:—'Baptism hath also his word and promise, which the priest ought to teach the people, and christen them in the English tongue, and not to play the popinjay with '*Credo*', say ye:—'*Volo*', say ye:—and '*Baptismum*', say ye:—for there ought to be no mumming in such a matter. The priest, before he baptizeth, asketh, saying:—'*Believest thou in God the Father Almighty, and in his Son Jesus Christ, and in the Holy Ghost, and that the congregation of Christ*



'*is holy?*—And they say, yea. Then the priest, upon this faith, baptizeth the child, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, *for the forgiveness of sins*, as Peter saith. (Acts ii.) *The washing without the word helpeth not*, but through the word it purifieth and cleanseth us; as thou readest (Eph. v.) how Christ cleanseth the congregation in the fountain of water through the word.—The word is the promise that God hath made. Now, as a preacher, in preaching the word of God, saveth the hearers that believe, so doth the washing, in that it preacheth and representeth unto us the promise that God hath made unto us in Christ. *The washing preacheth unto us* that we are cleansed with Christ's blood-shedding, which was an offering and a satisfaction for the sin of all that repent and believe, consenting and submitting themselves unto the will of God. The plunging into the water *signifieth* that we die, and are buried with Christ, as concerning the old life of sin, which is Adam. And the pulling out again, *signifieth* that we rise again with Christ, in a new life, full of the Holy Ghost, which shall teach us, and guide us, and work the will of God in us as thou seest.' (Rom. vi.)

And in the section on Penance, Tyndal writes thus:—'Now must a sacrament be an outward sign that may be seen, *to signify*, to represent, and to put a man in remembrance of some spiritual promise which cannot be seen but by faith only. Repentance, and all the good deeds which accompany repentance, to slay the lusts of the flesh, are signified by baptism. For Paul saith, (Rom. vi. as it is above rehearsed) *Remember ye not* (saith he) *that all we which are baptized in the name of Christ Jesus, are baptized to die with him?* We are buried with him in baptism for to die—that is, to kill the lusts and the rebellion which remaineth in the flesh. And after that, he saith, *Ye are dead, as concerning sin, but live unto God through Jesus Christ our Lord.* If thou look on the profession of our hearts, and on the spirit and forgiveness which we have received through Christ's merits, we are full dead: but if thou look on the rebellion of the flesh, we do but begin to die and to be baptized, that is, to drown and quench the lusts, and are full baptized at the last minute of death. And as concerning the working of the Spirit, we begin to live and grow every day more and more, both in knowledge and also in godly living, according as the lusts abate,—as a child receiveth the full soul at the first day, yet groweth daily in the operations and works thereof.'

And in the section on Confession, after alluding to the confession of the mouth, this reformer remarks:—'Another confession is there which goeth before faith and accompanieth repentance. For whosoever repenteth doth acknowledge his sins in his heart: and whosoever doth acknowledge his sins receiveth forgiveness, (as saith 1 John i.) *If we acknowledge our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness*; that is, because he hath promised, he must for his truth's sake do it. This confession is necessary all our lives long, as is repentance. And as thou understandest of repentance, so understand of this confession; for it is likewise included in the Sacrament of Baptism.



‘For we always repent and always acknowledge or confess our sins unto God, and yet despair not : but remember that we are washed in Christ’s blood—*which thing our baptism doth represent and signify unto us.*’

---

In “*An Exposition upon the V. VI. and VII. Chap. of St. Matthew,*” Tyndal writes:—‘To *believe* in Christ for the remission of sins, and of a thankfulness for that mercy,—to *love* the law truly, that is to say, to love God that is Father of all, and giveth all ; and Jesus Christ, that is Lord of us all, and bought us all, with all our hearts, souls, power and might ; and our brethren for our Father’s sake (because they be created after his image) ; and for our Lord and Master Christ’s sake, because they be the price of his blood ; and to *long for the life to come*, because this life cannot be led without sin. These three points, I say, are the profession and religion of a Christian man, and *the inward baptism of the heart, signified by the outward washing of the body* : and they are that spiritual character, badge or sign, wherewith God, through his Spirit, marketh all his immediately, and as soon as they be joined to Christ, and made members of his church by true faith. . . . *The Baptism that only availeth in the sight of God.*’

‘Finally, our works which God commandeth, and unto which be annexed his promises that he will reward them, are, as it were, very sacraments, and visible and sensible signs, tokens, earnest obligations, witnesses, testimonies, and a sure certifying of our souls, that God hath and will do according to his promise to strengthen our weak faith and to keep the promise in mind ; but they justify us not, no more than the visible works of the sacraments do. As for an example, *the work of baptism, that outward washing, which is the visible sacrament or sign, justifieth us not* : but God only justifieth us actively, as cause efficient or workman. God promiseth to justify whosoever is baptized to believe in Christ, and to keep the law of God, that is to say, to forgive them their fore-sins and to impute righteousness unto them, to take them for his sons, and to love them as well as though they were full righteous. *Christ hath deserved us that promise and that righteousness. And faith doth receive it, and God doth give it and impute it to faith, and not to the washing.* And the washing doth testify it and certify us of it, as the pope’s letters do certify the believers of the pope’s pardons. Now the letters help not or hinder, but that the pardons were as good without them, save only to establish weak souls that could not believe, except they read the letters, looked on the seal, and saw the print of St. Peter’s keys.’

---

And in a work entitled “*An Answer unto Sir Thomas More’s Dialogue,*” after stating, among many other objections raised against Tyndal, ‘*That he taught that the Sacrament had no virtue at all, but*

'by faith only,'\*—this reformer replies:—'*The faith of a repenting soul in Christ's blood doth justify only.* And the sacrament standeth in as good stead as a lively preacher. And as the preacher justifieth me not, but my faith in the doctrine, even so, *the sign justifieth not*, but the faith in the promise, which the sacrament signifieth and preacheth. And to preach is all the virtue of a sacrament. And where the sacraments preach not, there they have no virtue at all. And, Sir, we teach not as ye do, to believe in the sacrament or in the holy church, but to believe the sacrament and holy church.'—(*Fathers of the English Church*, Vol. 1, pp. 31, 180—185, 198—200, 237, 238, 277.)

## FRITH,

who suffered martyrdom in 1533, wrote a Treatise on Baptism, entitled "A Mirror or Looking-Glass, wherein you may behold the Sacrament of Baptism described by me, John Frith." He writes as follows:—'Considering the manifold and lamentable errors wherewith not the ignorant people only but also the learned (as they seem) have been seduced long as touching the blessed Sacrament of Baptism, I thought it expedient therein to write my mind. Trusting by that means to bring again the blind hearts of many unto the right way, and I doubt not but that the elect and chosen of God, who know their Shepherd's voice, and have the spirit to judge all things, shall easily perceive whether this be conformable to their Master's voice, and shall hereby be admonished to leave their wandering in the dark and loathsome ways which lead unto death, and to walk, without stumbling, in the comfortable light which bringeth their consciences to rest, and to such peace that passeth all understanding. . . . We must mark three things in every Sacrament, to be considered—the *Sign*—the *Signification*—and the *Faith*, which is given unto the words of God.'

'(1.) THE SIGN in baptism is, the plunging down in the material water and lifting up again, by the which, as by an outward badge, we are known to be of the number of them which profess Christ to be their Redeemer and Saviour. *This outward sign doth neither give us the Spirit of God, neither yet grace, that is, the favour of God.* For if, through the washing in the water, the spirit of grace were given, then should it follow, that whosoever were baptized in water should receive this precious gift; *but that is not so*: wherefore I must needs conclude, that this outward sign, by any power or influence that it hath, bringeth not the Spirit or favour of God. That every man receiveth not this treasure in baptism, it is evident, for put the case that a Jew or an infidel should say that he did believe, and believe not in deed, and upon his words were baptized in deed (for no man can judge what his heart is, but we must receive him unto baptism, if he confess our faith with his

---

\* This objection of Sir Thomas More, Lord High Chancellor of England in 1530, (the author of some severe treatises in defence of popery), is a still further proof of the views which the papists took of the sentiments of the English reformers, on the subject of the sacraments.

mouth, albeit his heart be far from thence), this miscreant, now thus baptized, hath received this outward sign and sacrament, as well as the most faithful man believing: howbeit *he neither receiveth the Spirit of God, neither yet any grace, but rather condemnation.* . . . . Wherefore it followeth that the outward sign giveth no man any grace. Moreover, if the Spirit of God and His Grace were bound unto the sacraments, then, where the sacraments were ministered there must the Spirit of Grace wait on, and where they were not ministered, should be neither spirit nor grace: but that is false, for Cornelius and all his household received the Holy Ghost, *before they were baptized*; insomuch that Peter said, *May any man forbid that these should be baptized with water, which have received the Holy Ghost as well as we?* and so he commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord.—Here may we see that as the Spirit of God lighteth where he will, neither is he bound to anything: yea, and this example doth well declare unto us that *the sacraments are given to be an outward witness unto all the congregation, of that grace which is given before privately unto every man.* . . . . When we baptize one that is come unto the age of discretion, we ask of him, whether he believe: if he answer yea, and desire baptism, then is he baptized, so that we require faith in him before he be baptized, which is the gift of God and cometh of grace, and so it is an outward sign of his invisible faith, which before was given him of God.—If an infant be brought unto baptism, (whom his friends offer up willingly, to sanctify and fulfil the commandment and ordinance of God,) we enquire of his friends, before the congregation, whether they will that their child be baptized, and when they have answered yea, then receiveth he baptism. Here also went before the promise of God, that he, of his grace, reputeth our infants, no less of the congregation than the infants of the Hebrews, and through baptism doth the congregation receive him, which was first received through grace of the promise.—Thus may we see that baptism bringeth not grace, but doth testify unto the congregation, that he which is baptized had such grace given him before: so is baptism a *Sacrament*, that is, the sign of an holy thing, even a token of the grace and free mercy which was before given him,—a visible example of invisible grace, which is done and given through the gentleness of God. By this we may perceive how gross their ignorance is, who, without discretion, condemn the infants that depart out of this world, not baptized in our material water. For *if that water give no grace, as I have sufficiently proved, why should they condemn more before that washing than after?* Besides, that the election of God is free and followeth not our faith, but faith followeth the election, as it is written. And there believed even as many as were ordained unto everlasting life; for they that are chosen from the beginning, are no doubt chosen before they had faith.—We ought not therefore to give such unadvised judgment on these children, which, by their age, have not yet heard our faith—seeing God's election is hidden from our eyes. The children of Israel were a people whom God had chosen from among all nations of the world, and gave them



‘circumcision for a token and memorial of that election:—which  
‘circumcision was a figure of our baptism, and they thought that  
‘the Gentiles, which were not carnally circumcised, had been all  
‘condemned. But their opinion deceived them, for there were also  
‘of the Gentiles, which, although they were not circumcised out-  
‘wardly, were elect of God, and were spiritually circumcised, which  
‘only is the thing that God regardeth, as Paul testifieth, saying,—  
‘He is not a Jew which is a Jew outward, neither is that circum-  
‘cision anything which is outward in the flesh: but he is a Jew  
‘which is hid within the circumcision of the heart, (which is the  
‘cutting off of carnal desires and is the true circumcision.) This  
‘circumcision was in price with God—with the which, the Gentiles  
‘(as Job) were circumcised. And, in like manner, may we say of  
‘our baptism, he is not a Christian man which is washed with water:  
‘neither is that baptism which is outward in the flesh; but that is  
‘the very baptism which God alloweth, to be baptized spiritually in  
‘the heart, that is, to subdue and weed out the branches of sin, that  
‘it reign not in your mortal bodies and bring them into bondage  
‘under it, of the which our baptism is but a sign. And there are  
‘many (I doubt not) which are thus spiritually baptized, although  
‘their bodies touch no water, as there were Gentiles thus spiritually  
‘circumcised, and yet never cut of their foreskin. . . . .  
‘Now is there an opinion risen among certain which affirm *that*  
‘*children may not be baptized until they come unto a perfect age, and*  
‘*that because they have no faith*—but verily methinketh, that they  
‘are far from the meekness of Christ and his Spirit, which, when  
‘children were brought unto him, received them lovingly and em-  
‘braced them in his arms, (Mark x.) and when his disciples blamed  
‘the bringers, he called them unto him, saying, *Suffer children to*  
‘*come unto me, and forbid them not, for of such is the kingdom of*  
‘*heaven* (Luke xviii.)—And albeit they have no faith, but are only  
‘of that invisible congregation that is without spot or wrinkle: yet,  
‘as I have said, *they have a promise, as well as the children of the*  
‘*Hebrews*, by the which they are of the visible congregation:  
‘*which thing only is testified in their baptism.* So it appeareth  
‘these men are ignorant what baptism is. For our baptism doth  
‘not testify that we are of that pure congregation which was chosen  
‘and sanctified in Christ before the world began, which have their  
‘names written in the Book of Life, of the which it is not possible  
‘one should perish: for then were it a false testimony, seeing many,  
‘which are baptized, fall afterward into perilous heresies and utter  
‘desperation, which bringeth them unto death everlasting. And as  
‘for faith, *if they have none when they are baptized, let them pray*  
‘*unto God to give it them afterward:* for the lack of faith hurteth  
‘not the sacrament, but *the sacrament may be as well ministered*  
‘*unto a miscreant as to a faithful, if he say that he hath faith, or*  
‘*have any promise of God.*’

‘(2.) THE SIGNIFICATION of Baptism is described of Paul in the  
‘Sixth of the Romans, That as we are plunged bodily into the  
‘water, even so we are dead and buried with Christ from sin; and as  
‘we are lifted again out of the water, even so are we risen with



Christ from our sins, that we might hereafter walk in new conversation of life. So that these two things (that is, to be plunged in the water and lifted up again) do signify and represent the whole pith and effect of baptism, that is, the mortification of our old Adam and the rising up of our new man. . . . Insomuch that a Christian man's life is nothing else, save a continual baptism, which is begun when we are dipped in the water, and is put in continual use and exercise as long as the infection of sin remaineth in our bodies, which is never utterly vanquished until the hour of death:—and there is the great Goliath slain with his own sword (that is death, which is the power of sin) and the gate of everlasting life is opened unto us: and thus is Paul to be understood (Gal. iii.) where he saith, *All ye that are baptized into Christ have put Christ on you*:—that is, you have promised to die with Christ, as touching your sins and worldly desires past, and to become new men or creatures and members of Christ. This have we all promised unto the congregation, and it is *represented in our baptism*. . . . And for this cause, it is called of Paul, the fountain of the new birth and regeneration, (Titus iii.) because it signifieth that we will indeed renounce and utterly forsake our old life, and purge our members from the works of iniquity through the virtue of the Holy Ghost, which as the water or fire doth cleanse the body, even so doth it purify the heart from all uncleanness: yea, it is a common phrase in Scripture to call the Holy Ghost water and fire, because these two elements express, so lively, his purging operation.—Now have we expounded the signification of Baptism, which signification we may obtain only by

‘(3.) FAITH—for if thou be baptized a thousand times with water, and have no faith, it availeth thee no more towards God, than it doth a goose, when she ducketh herself under the water. Therefore if thou wilt obtain the profit of baptism, thou must have *faith*, that is, thou must be surely persuaded, that thou art newly-born again, not by water only, but by water and the Holy Ghost, (John iii.) and that thou art become the child of God, and that thy sins are not imputed to thee, but forgiven through the blood and passion of Christ, according unto the promise of God. This faith have neither the devils, neither yet the wicked. For the wicked cannot believe the remission of their sins, but fall unto utter desperation and make God a liar, as much as in them is. For they believe not the testimony which he gave of his Son, and this is that testimony, that *all which believe on Him have everlasting life*, (John iii.) And the devils cannot believe it: for they have no promise made unto them. Thus, through Christ's blood, whereof our baptism hath its full strength and vigour, are we regenerate and made at one with the Father; for by our first natural birth, we are the children of wrath, (Eph. ii.) and the enemies of God. (Rom. v.)

‘Finally, baptism is an ordinance instituted of God (and no practice of man's imagination) put in use in Christ's time, and, after his resurrection, commanded to be administered unto all that believe, whether they were Jews or Gentiles. For Christ

‘saith to his apostles, *go ye and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.* Wherefore, although it seem never so exterior a thing, yet ought it to be had in great price and much reverence, *because it was commanded of God to be done.* Besides that, it is an outward sign or witness unto the congregation of the invisible promise given before by grace, unto every private man, and by it doth the congregation receive him openly to be counted one of them, which were first received by faith, or through the grace of the promise—it putteth us also in remembrance, that we, advertizing the kindness of God and our promise in baptism, may learn to die and mortify our rebelling members—*otherwise giveth it no grace, neither hath it any secret virtue*, as we have sufficiently proved.’

---

In a work “*On the Sacrament of the Body of Christ, occasioned by some Animadversions of Sir Thomas More,*” the reformer Frith observes, ‘The second cause of their (that is, the sacraments’) institution is,—that they may be a means to bring us unto faith:—and to imprint it the deeper in us; for it doth customably the more move a man to believe, when he perceiveth the thing expressed to *divers senses at once*, as by example, . . . . The word doth but only certify the thing unto a man by the sense of *hearing*; but when, with my promise immediately after, I hold up my finger, then do I not only certify him by the sense of hearing, but also by his *sight*, he perceiveth that that fact confirmeth my word:—and in the clapping of hands, he perceiveth both by his sight and *feeling*, beside the word, that I will fulfil my promise. And likewise it is in this sacrament, Christ promised them that he would give his body to be slain for their sins,’ &c.

And the third cause for the institution of sacraments, which Frith assigns, is thus expressed: ‘They that have received these blessed tidings and word of health, do love to publish this felicity unto other men, and to give thanks before the face of the congregation unto their bounteous benefactors, and, as much as in them is, to draw all people to the praising of God with them—which thing, though it be partly done by the preaching of God’s word and fruitful exhortations, yet doth that visible token and sacrament, if a man understand what is meant thereby, more effectually work in them both faith and thanksgiving, than doth the bare word:—but if a man wot not what it meaneth, and seeketh health in the sacrament and outward sign, then may he be well likened unto a fond fellow which, when he is very dry, and an honest man shews him an ale-pole, and tells him *that there is good ale eno*’, would go and suck the ale-pole, trusting to get drink out of it and so to quench his thirst. Now a wise man will tell him that he playeth the fool—for the ale-pole doth but *signify* that there is good ale in the house where the ale-pole standeth, and will tell him that he must go near the house, and there he shall find the drink, and not stand sucking the ale-pole in vain: for it shall not ease him, but

‘rather make him more dry: for the ale-pole doth *signify* good ale, yet the ale-pole itself is not good ale, neither is there any good ale in the ale-pole. And likewise it is in *all sacraments: for if we understand not what they mean, and seek health in the outward sign, then we suck the ale-pole, and labour in vain.*’—(*Fathers of the English Church*, Vol. 1, pp. 383—392, 449—451.)

### LATIMER,

Bishop of Worcester, who was burnt at the same stake with Bishop Ridley, in 1555, and had a special hand in the Reformation, in a sermon preached before King Edward VI., speaks thus:—‘The preaching of the gospel is the power of God to every man that doth believe. He (Paul) means God’s word opened. It is the instrument and thing whereby we are saved. Beware, beware, ye diminish not this office: for if ye do, ye decay God’s power to all that do believe. Christ saith consonant to the same, except a man be born again, from above, he cannot see the kingdom of God. He must have a regeneration, and what is this regeneration? *It is not to be christened in water (as these firebrands\* do expound it) and nothing else.*—How is it to be expounded then? St. Peter sheweth that one place of Scripture declareth another. It is the circumstance and collation of places that make Scripture plain. Saith St. Peter we be born again. How? Not by a mortal seed, but by an immortal. What is this immortal seed? By the word of the living God, by the word preached and opened—*thus cometh in our new birth.*’—(*Fathers of the English Church*, Vol. 2, pp. 654, 655.)

BISHOP LATIMER also, in his conference with Bishop Ridley, explains the strong language sometimes used by the early fathers of the Christian church, on the Sacraments thus: ‘The fathers have both herbs and weeds, and papists commonly gather the weeds, and leave the herbs. And they (the fathers) speak many times more vehemently in sound of words, than they did mean indeed: or than they would have done if they had foreseen *what sophistical wranglers should have succeeded them.* Now the papists are given to *brawl about words, to the maintenance of their own inventions, and rather follow the sound of words than attain unto the meaning of the fathers*, so that it is dangerous to trust them in citing the fathers.—In all ages the devil hath stirred up some light heads to esteem the sacraments but lightly, as to be *empty and bare signs*, whom the fathers have resisted so fiercely, that in their fervour they seem, in *sound of words*, to run too far the other way, and to give too much to the sacraments, when they did think more *measurably*: and therefore they are to be read *warily*, with *sound judgment.*’—(*Fathers of the English Church*, Vol. 4, p. 92.)

---

\* Latimer means the popish priests.



## CRANMER,

Archbishop of Canterbury, — martyr 1555, — in his earlier writings, may be quoted as speaking unscripturally upon the Sacraments; \* but ‘the path of the just is as the shining light, that shineth more ‘and more unto the perfect day;’ and as this martyred saint advanced towards the close of his earthly course, his views on all essential truth became more matured, and his final sentiments stand recorded in King Edward’s Articles, settled in Convocation in 1552. One thing however is particularly observable in the writings of this great reformer, (namely) — *the frequent use he makes of the sign for the thing signified when speaking on the sacraments.* He adopted this mode of expression to a greater extent *than any of the other reformers*: — indeed, his language became the subject of misconception and offence *during his own life.* — Cranmer, however, replied to the objection and justified his writings; — and in doing this has entered largely upon a question deeply interesting to ourselves. It may not therefore be unseasonable to introduce some of his observations.

In a work written by Cranmer, and printed in 1550, entitled “A Defence of the True and Catholic Doctrine of the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Our Saviour Christ,” the Archbishop observes: — ‘These speeches, *to eat Christ’s body and to drink Christ’s blood,* be speeches not taken in the proper signification of every ‘word; but, by translation of these words (eating and drinking) ‘from the signification of a corporeal thing, *to signify a spiritual thing*; and by calling a thing that signifieth by the name of the thing ‘*which is signified thereby*: — which is no rare nor strange thing, but ‘an usual manner and phrase in common speech. And yet, lest ‘this fault should be imputed unto us, *that we do feign things of our own heads, without authority, as the papists be accustomed to do,* here ‘shall be cited sufficient authority, as well of Scripture as of old ‘ancient authors, to approve the same.’

For the purpose of confirming his assertion, the Archbishop first speaks of the words of our Saviour Christ, John vi. 48, 51, 54, 63; — he then refers to St. Paul, 1 Cor. x. 3, 4; and afterwards he quotes largely from *Origen, Chrysostom, Austin, Tertullian, Cyprian, Jerome, and Ambrose,* observing, ‘If I should rehearse all the ‘authorities . . . which make mention of this matter, it would ‘weary the reader too much.’ Among his quotations from Austin, is the following: — ‘As every *Good-Friday*, as often as it returneth ‘from year to year, we call it, The Day of Christ’s Passion — and ‘every *Easter-Day*, we call The Day of His Resurrection — and ‘every day in the year, we say, that Christ is offered: — and the ‘*Sacrament of His Body*, we call it his body: — and the *Sacrament*

---

\* Cranmer, at so late a period as 1548, (the first year of Edward VI.) in his Catechism, maintained there were *three sacraments*, — viz. Baptism, Absolution, and the Lord’s Supper. — (*Fathers of the English Church*, Vol. 3, pp. 292, 293.)



of His Blood, we call it his blood:—and our Baptism, St. Paul calleth our burial with Christ: and yet, in very deed, Christ never suffered but once—never rose but once—never was offered but once: nor, in very deed, in baptism we be not buried: nor the Sacrament of Christ's Body, is not his body: nor the Sacrament of His Blood, is not his blood:—but so they be called, because they be figures—sacraments and representations of the things themselves which they signify, and whereof they bear the name . . . . A thing which signifieth (saith St. Austin), is wont to be called by the name of the thing which it signifieth, as it is written in the Scripture, *The seven ears BE seven years.* The Scripture saith, not SIGNIFIETH seven years—and the seven kine BE seven years—and many others like. And so said St. Paul, *That the STONE WAS CHRIST*, and not that it *signified Christ*; but even as it had been HE INDEED, which nevertheless *was not Christ by substance, but by signification* . . . therefore in Sacraments, we must not consider what they be, but what they signify: for they be signs of things—*being one thing and signifying another.*'

After citing these authorities, Cranmer adds: 'Marvel not, good reader! that Christ at the time spake in figures, when he did institute that sacrament (alluding to the Lord's Supper), seeing that IT IS THE NATURE OF ALL SACRAMENTS TO BE FIGURES;—and although the Scripture be full of schemes, tropes, and figures, yet, *specially, it useth them when it speaketh of sacraments,* . . . as when, in baptism, he (Christ) said, That we must be baptized with the Holy Ghost, meaning of spiritual baptism; and like speech used St. John the Baptist, saying of Christ, That he should baptize with the Holy Ghost and FIRE,—and Christ said, That we must be BORN AGAIN, or else we cannot see the kingdom of God; and said also, *Whosoever shall drink of that WATER which I shall give him, he shall never be dry again; but the water which I shall give him shall be made within him a well, which shall spring into everlasting life.* And St. Paul saith, *That in baptism we CLOTHE US with Christ, and be BURIED with him.*—This baptism and washing by the fire and the Holy Ghost, this new birth, this water that springeth in a man and floweth into everlasting life, and this clothing and burial cannot be understood of any material baptism, material washing, material birth, clothing and burial, but by translation of things visible into things invisible, *they must be understood SPIRITUALLY and FIGURATIVELY.*

In the same book, on the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, the Archbishop further remarks: 'We being, as it were, double men (or having every one of us two men in us, the new and the old man, the spiritual man and the carnal man,) have a double nativity —One of our first carnal father, Adam, by whom, as by ancient inheritance, cometh unto us malediction and everlasting damnation; and the other of our heavenly Adam, that is to say, of Christ, by whom we be made heirs of celestial benediction and everlasting glory and immortality: and, because this Adam is spiritual, therefore our generation by him must be spiritual. . . . AND OUR SPIRITUAL REGENERATION BY HIM IS PLAINLY SET FORTH IN

'BAPTISM; . . . and because our sights be so feeble that we cannot see the *spiritual water* wherewith we be washed in baptism, . . . therefore to help our infirmities and to make us the better to see the same, with a pure faith, our Saviour Christ hath set forth the same, as it were, before our eyes, by *sensible signs and tokens*, which we be daily used and accustomed unto;—and because the common custom of men is to wash in water, therefore our *spiritual regeneration* in Christ, or *spiritual washing* in his blood, is DECLARED unto us in baptism by water.'

Cranmer next proceeds to vindicate 'certain places of ancient authors, which, at the first shew, seem to make for the papists' purpose—that evil men do eat and drink the *very* flesh and blood of Christ:—and in doing this, the Archbishop remarks, '*If those places be truly and thoroughly weighed*, it shall appear that not one of them maketh for their error.' And then quoting a passage from St. Austin, on 1 Cor. xi. 27, he observes:—'Consider the place of St. Austin diligently, and then it shall evidently appear that he meant not of the eating of Christ's body, but of the sacrament thereof. For the intent of St. Austin there is to prove that *good things avail not to such persons as do evil use them*, and that many things, which of themselves be good, and *be good to some*, yet to other some they be not good.—As that *light* is good for whole eyes and hurteth sore eyes; that *meat* which is good for some, is evil for other some; one *medicine* healeth some and maketh others sick; one *harness* doth harm one and cumbereth another; one *coat* is meet for one and too strait for another; and, after other examples, at the last, St. Austin sheweth the same to be true in the sacraments, *both of Baptism and of the Lord's Body*, which, he saith, *do profit only them that receive the same worthily*. . . . St. Austin calleth the bread and the cup the flesh and the blood, *not that they be so indeed, but that they so signify*. . . . In sacraments (saith he) is to be considered *not what they be, but what they shew*, for they be *signs of other things*—being one thing and *signifying another*. . . . In baptism those that come feignedly and those that come unfeignedly, *both* be washed with the sacramental water, but BOTH BE NOT WASHED WITH THE HOLY GHOST AND CLOTHED WITH CHRIST.'

And the Archbishop then proceeds especially to the vindication of himself, in the following terms: 'As before is at length declared, a *figure* hath the name of the thing that is signified thereby: as a man's image is called a *man*—a lion's image, a *lion*—a bird's image, a *bird*, and an image of a tree and herb, is called a *tree* or *herb*. . . . So were we wont to say, Our *Lady* of Walsingham—Our *Lady* of Ipswich—Our *Lady* of Grace—Our *Lady* of Pity—*St. Peter* of Milan—*St. John* of Amias, and such like; not meaning the things themselves, but calling their *images by the name of the things by them represented*. And likewise we were wont to say, Great *St. Christopher* of York or Lincoln—Our *Lady* smileth or rocketh her child. Let us go in pilgrimage to *St. Peter* at Rome, and *St. James* at Compostella—and a thousand like speeches which were not understood of the *very things*, but

'only of the images of them. So doth St. John Chrysostom say, 'That we see Christ with our eyes, touch him, feel him, and grope him with our hands, fix our teeth in his flesh, taste it, break it, eat it, and digest it, make red our tongues, and die them with his blood, and swallow it and drink it. . . . And in a Catechism by me translated and set forth,\* *I used like manner of speech*, saying, *That with our bodily mouths we receive the body and blood of Christ*: which my saying divers ignorant persons, not used to read old ancient authors, nor acquainted with their phrase and manner of speech, DID CARP and REPREHEND, for the lack of good understanding.† For this speech, and others before rehearsed of Chrysostom, and all others like, be not understood of the very flesh and blood of our Saviour Christ (which, in very deed, we neither feel nor see): but that which we do to the bread and wine, by a figurative speech, is

\* Cranmer here refers to his Catechism of 1548. He elsewhere speaks of it as 'The Catechism of Germany by me translated into English.'—(*Fathers of the English Church*, Vol. 3, note on p. 319.)

† The strong figurative language used by Cranmer, in speaking of the Lord's Supper, brought on him the charge of holding the real presence of Christ's body in that sacrament.—To one of his opponents (Dr. Smith) Cranmer replies thus: 'Unto which false report I have answered, in my fourth book, the eighth chapter:—but this I confess of myself, that not long before I wrote the said Catechism (that is, not long before 1548,) *I was in that error* of the real presence, as I was, many years past, in divers other errors, as of Transubstantiation, of the Sacrifice propitiatory of the Priests in the Mass, of Pilgrimages, Purgatory, Pardons, and many other superstitions and errors that came from Rome; being brought up from youth in them, and nursed therein, for lack of good instruction, from my youth; the outrageous floods of papistical errors at that time overflowing the world.—For the which, and other mine offences in youth, I do daily pray unto God for mercy and pardon, saying, Good Lord, remember not mine ignorances and offences of my youth:—but, after it had pleased God to shew unto me, by his Holy Word, a more perfect knowledge of his Son Jesus Christ, from time to time as I grew in knowledge of him, *by little and little I put away my former ignorance*.—And as God, of his mercy, gave me light, so, through his grace, I opened mine eyes to receive it, and did not wilfully repugn unto God, and remain in darkness. And I trust in God's mercy and pardon for my former errors, because I erred but of frailness and ignorance.—And now I may say of myself, as St. Paul said: *When I was like a babe, or a child, in the knowledge of Christ, I spake like a child and understood like a child: but now that I come to man's estate and growing in Christ, through his grace and mercy, I have put away that childishness*.'—(See *Fathers of the English Church*, Vol. 3, note on p. 31.)—And here it may be noticed, that as the Articles declare the Sacrament of BAPTISM to be 'the sign of Regeneration or new birth,' &c. (Art. 27th); and in the Baptismal Services it is said, 'Seeing this child is regenerate,' &c. &c.—so also the Articles declare the Sacrament of the LORD'S SUPPER to be 'The sacrament (or sign) of our redemption by Christ's death.' (Art. 28th.) And in the Catechism it is said, that '*the body and blood of Christ are VERILY and INDEED TAKEN, and RECEIVED*,' &c.—Now it is obvious that these declarations on the sacraments, must be either both taken literally, or else both taken figuratively.—Consistency of interpretation would require this.—If baptism be regeneration, then, in the Lord's Supper, there is the real presence: but Cranmer asserts that the doctrine of the real presence is erroneous; it therefore follows, as a necessary consequence, (in his judgment, at least,) that the doctrine of baptismal regeneration (as inherent in the outward sign) is also erroneous:—both declarations on the sacraments being opened and made plain by the very key which Cranmer himself used in solving these questions—namely, *the use of the sign for the thing signified*.



‘spoken to be done to the flesh and blood, *because they be the very SIGNS, FIGURES, and TOKENS instituted of Christ, to represent unto us, his very flesh and blood.* And yet, as with our corporal eyes, corporal hands and mouths, we do corporally see, feel, taste, and eat the bread, and drink the wine (being the sign and sacraments of Christ’s body)—even so, with our spiritual eyes, hands, and mouths, we do spiritually see, feel, taste, and eat his very flesh, and drink his very blood. . . . And as this is the most true, so is it full and sufficient to answer all things that the papists can bring in this matter, that hath any appearance for their party.’—(*Fathers of the English Church*, Vol. 3, pp. 427, 428, 431, 436—438, 446—448, 472, 490—494.)

## OBSERVATIONS

### ON THE PRECEDING EXTRACTS FROM CRANMER.

(1.) That the habit of using the sign for the thing signified, especially when speaking of the Sacraments, *did prevail* to a considerable extent with ecclesiastical writers, *both before and at the time of the Reformation*,—and is therefore to be looked for in the productions of those days.

(2.) That any difficulties which may seem to arise from detached passages from the writings of Cranmer on the Sacraments, ought to be submitted to the test which *he himself* has established for the right understanding of them;—namely, *the use of the sign for the thing signified.*

(3.) That a *becoming deference and respect* to the avowed sentiments and habits of expression adopted by the early fathers of the English church (especially by *Cranmer*, who was known to have had so large a share in the compilation of her formularies) ought ever to be exercised by the candid and honest inquirer after truth, in order to the attainment of a fair and legitimate interpretation of any questionable expressions which may be found in our Liturgical Services,—*provided that nothing be admitted which militates against the plain, literal and grammatical sense* of her Articles.

## BECON,

Chaplain to Archbishop Cranmer, and said to have been the editor of the First Book of Homilies,\* speaks of the Sacraments thus: ‘I have heard say, that the Sacraments of the Old Law were only signs and tokens of God’s grace or favour to the Jews: but that the Sacraments of the New Testament are not only signs and tokens and seals of God’s grace, but that they also *give grace* to

---

\* The first Book of Homilies was published in the reign of Edward VI., in 1547, and was supposed to have been written by Cranmer, Ridley, Latimer, and Becon:—the second Book was finished about the time of Edward’s death, though not published till the reign of Elizabeth, in 1562, and was probably written by Bishop Jewell.

such as receive them. This doctrine is contrary to the word of God—*brought lately into the church by papists.* . . . The sacraments of themselves are nothing else than, as St. Paul terms them, the *seals* of righteousness. . . . Baptism brought not grace, but testifies unto the congregation, that he which is baptized hath *already* received grace and the Spirit of God.’—*See Becon’s New Catechism.*

## HOOPER,

Bishop of Gloucester, who was burnt in 1555, in a work entitled “*A Declaration of Christ and of His Office, compiled by John Hooper, A.D. 1547,*” writes thus:—‘Although Christ said of the bread this is my body, it is well known that he purposed to institute a sacrament, therefore he spoke of a sacrament *sacramentally*. To speak *sacramentally* is to give the name of the thing to the sign.’ . . . And in the same work, Hooper remarks,—‘Although Baptism be a Sacrament to be received and honourably used of all men, yet it *sanctifieth no man: and such as attribute the Remission of sins unto the external Sign do offend* . . . *inwardly it changeth no man* . . . Such as be baptized must remember that repentance and faith precede this external sign, and in Christ the purgation was inwardly obtained *before the external sign was given.* . . . No man should condemn nor neglect this exterior sign for the commandment’s sake; though it have no power to purge from sin, yet it confirmeth the purgation of sin, and the *act of itself pleaseth God, because the receivers thereof obey the will of his commandment.* Like as the King’s Majesty that now is,\* immediately after the death of his father, was the true and legitimate King of England, right heir unto the Crown and received his coronation, *not to make himself thereby king,* but to *manifest* that the kingdom appertained unto him before. He took the crown to *confirm* his right and title. Had all England said, Nay—and by force contrary unto God’s laws and man’s laws, with an exterior ceremony and pomp crowned any other man, he should have been *an adulterous and wrong king, with all his solemnities and coronation.* Though this ceremony confirm and manifest a king in his kingdom, *yet it maketh not a king,* but the laws of God and of the land, that give, by succession, the right of the kingdom to the old king’s first heir-male in England and other realms. And the babe in the cradle hath as good a right and claim, and is as true a king, in his cradle *uncrowned,* as his father was, though he reigned a crowned king forty years. And this right of the babe should be defended and manifested, not only by the ceremony of coronation but with all obedience and true subjection.—*So it is in the church of Christ.* Man is made the brother of Christ and heir of eternal life, *by God’s only mercy received by faith, before he receive any ceremony to confirm and manifest openly his right and title.* He saith, ‘he believeth in the Father,

\* Edward was only nine years old at the death of his father, Henry VIII. in 1517.

‘the Son, and the Holy Ghost, and believeth (he saith) the remission of sin. He doth not only deny the devil, the world and sin, but saith, he will forsake him *for ever*, and serve his Master, the Lord of virtue, King of heaven and earth. Thus assured of God, and cleansed from sin in Christ, he hath *the livery of God* given unto him—*Baptism*—the which no Christian man should neglect, *and yet not attribute his sanctification unto the external sign*. As the king’s majesty may not attribute his right unto the crown, but unto God and unto his father, who hath not only given him grace to be born into the world, but also to govern as a king in the world, whose right and title the crown confirmeth, and sheweth the same unto all the world,—whereas this right, by God and natural succession, *precedeth the coronation*. *The ceremony availeth nothing*. A traitor may receive the crown and yet be true king nothing the more; so an hypocrite and infidel may receive the external sign of baptism, and yet be no Christian man any the more, as Simon Magus and others.—*Sacraments must be used holily, and yet not to have the office of Christ added unto them*. Solely it is his office to sanctify and purge from sin. *I take nothing from the Sacraments, but honour them and extol them in all things as they be worthy, HOW-  
BEIT NOT TOO MUCH.*

---

Also in a work entitled “*A Godly Confession and Protestation of the Christian Faith, made by John Hooper*,” (printed 1550) this martyr says :—‘As for those that say, Circumcision and baptism be alike, and yet *attribute the remission of original sin to baptism*, which was never given unto circumcission, they not only destroy the similitude and equality that should be between them, but also take from Christ remission of sin, and translate it unto the water and element of baptism.’

---

And in another work, written by Hooper, entitled “*A Declaration of the Ten Holy Commandments of Almighty God*,” (printed 1550) he observes,—‘Likewise those that attribute more than is due or less than is due unto the Holy Sacraments instituted by Christ, *commit sacrilege*. *They take from the Sacraments too much* that say, they be but external signs to know the church of Christ by from such as be not of the church, as the Roman once was known from another citizen by his gown: also those that say they may be done and left undone, as it pleaseth man that useth them. *Those add too much to the sacraments* that attribute as much unto them, as unto the grace and promise that they confirm, as to the Sacrament of Baptism, remission of sin, when it is but an external confirmation of it.’—(*See Fathers of the English Church*, Vol. 5, pp. 155, 168—171, 222, 399, 400.)

---

And in alluding to the strong expressions used by the Christian fathers on the Sacrament of Baptism, Hooper remarks: ‘The fathers



thought it best to name the sacraments by the name of *the thing that was represented* by the sacrament: yet in many places of their writings they so interpret themselves that no man, *except he be wilfully blind*, can say but they understood the sacraments—to signify, *and not to be the thing signified*—to confirm, and not to exhibit grace—to help, and not to give faith—to seal, and not to win the promise of God—to shew what we be *before* the use of them, and not to make us the thing we declare to be after them—to shew we are Christ's—to shew we be in grace, and not by them to be received into grace—to shew we be saved, and not to be saved by them—to *shew we are regenerated, and not to be regenerated by them*. Thus the old doctors meant. They add too much to the sacraments that attribute as much unto them, as unto the grace and promise that they confirm, *as to the Sacrament of Baptism, remission of sin, —when it is but an external confirmation of it.\*—*(*British Reformers*, p. 162.)

## HADDON,

a zealous promoter of the Reformation (whom Ridley describes 'more fit to be a bishop than a parish-priest,') in 1565 wrote an answer to Osorius, a Portuguese Roman Catholic Bishop, and to his slanderous invectives against the English reformers.—In this Defence of the English Church, speaking of the Sacraments, Haddon observes: 'They be sacred mysteries of our religion—they be assured pledges of heavenly grace: and yet God the Father, which made us of clay, is not tied to his workmanship, nor bound to his creatures; but *taketh mercy of whom he will have mercy, and forgiveth our sins for his own sake*, (Exod. xxxii.; Rom. ix.); not for the sacrament's sake.—Lastly, *Life everlasting is the gift of God through Jesus Christ* (Rom. vi.); not through operation of the sacraments, And therefore we do use the true sacraments as most sacred things, as *pledges* of our faith, and *seals* of our salvation; and yet we do not attribute so much unto them as though, by the means of them, the grace of God *must of necessity* be poured out upon us, by the works wrought, AS THROUGH CONDUIT-PIPES. *This IMPIETY we turn over to your school-men—THE VERY FIRST SPRINGS OF THIS POISON. For inheritance is given of faith according to grace*. (Rom. x.)—The sacraments are reverend SIGNS of God's grace unto us—are excellent MONUMENTS of our religion—are most perfect WITNESSES of our salvation. If you cannot be satisfied with these commendations of the sacraments, heap up more unto them at your choice; we shall be well-pleased withal,

---

\* In that beautifully scriptural homily 'On the Salvation of Mankind,' the outward rite of baptism stands identified with the remission of sin and justification.—The XXXIX. Articles (the church's sole interpreter) affirm that, in baptism 'the forgiveness of sins is visibly signed and sealed,' (Art. 27), not conferred. The homily puts the *sign* for the *thing signified*:—any other interpretation is inadmissible, as violating the literal and grammatical sense of the Article.

‘so that you BIND NOT THE GRACE OF GOD TO THE SIGNS, OF  
 ‘OF VERY NECESSITY.—For we are not saved by the receiving of  
 ‘these sacraments ; *but if we confess with our mouth our Lord Jesus*  
 ‘*Christ, and with our hearts believe that God raised him again from*  
 ‘*death* (Rom. x.), this confession only will save us. Julian, the  
 ‘Emperor, was baptized in the name of Jesus, yet died in manifest  
 ‘blasphemy. Judas Iscariot did feed upon the Sacrament of the  
 ‘Eucharist, yet, immediately after supper, he departed to the ene-  
 ‘mies of our Lord Jesu, and betrayed innocent blood.—What  
 ‘needeth many words? Sacraments are most precious TOKENS of  
 ‘God’s favour, but they *do not* OBTAIN *God’s favour*.—Sacraments  
 ‘are excellent MONUMENTS of godliness, but they do not MAKE  
 ‘godliness.—*He that will glory, let him glory in the Lord*, not in  
 ‘the sacraments.’—(*Fathers of the English Church*, Vol. 8, pp. 234  
 —236.)

‘Thus saith the Lord : Stand ye in the ways and see, and ask for  
 ‘the *old paths*, where is the good way, and walk therein ; and ye  
 ‘shall find rest for your souls.’ (Jer. vi. 16.)

## APPENDIX.

---

### Church Government & Apostolical Succession.

---

#### THE THREE-FOLD ORDER OF THE PRIESTHOOD.

‘1.—For some time after our Lord’s ascension the church was confined to Jerusalem, and the work of the ministry performed apparently by the *Apostles alone*, (see Acts, chap. i—v., particularly ii. 42; iv. 35; v. 29, 42.) But *when the number of the Disciples was multiplied*, (Acts vi. 1) it was considered by the apostles that there were some parts of the ministerial office which might with advantage be delegated to others, and accordingly the order of Deacons\* was appointed for the subordinate duties of the ministry, in order that the apostles might *give themselves continually to prayer and to the ministry of the word*, (Acts vi. 4,) and they were ordained to their office by the imposition of hands by the Apostles (Acts vi. 6.)

‘2.—Further we find that, in the church thus existing at Jerusalem, there was also an order of Presbyters sharing with the Apostles themselves the supreme government of the church, for upon the dispute respecting circumcision, the *apostles and elders*† (presbyters) *came together for to consider of this matter*, (Acts xv. 6.) And though it appears that there were others present in such councils besides them, (Acts xv. 22, 23,) yet it is evident that the decisions depended upon the apostles and elders (presbyters) only; for it is said that Paul and Silas, *as they went through the cities, delivered them the decrees for to keep, that were ordained of THE APOSTLES AND ELDERS* (presbyters) *that were at Jerusalem*, (Acts xvi. 4, see also xxi. 18, 25.)—Evidently then, there were in the church at Jerusalem, three distinct orders, Apostles, Presbyters, and Deacons.—Who the presbyters were, or how appointed, or to what office, we have yet to enquire.’

‘3.—Passing on then to a subsequent period of the Apostolical History, we find the apostles *ordaining presbyters in every church*,

---

\* A DEACON (διάκονος) means an ordinary servant, or a servant of God in secular affairs; but its specific meaning is a Christian minister of the lowest order.—(ED.)

† The name ELDER (πρεσβύτερος) is sometimes applied, in Scripture, to the clergy of every order; but its appropriate application is to ministers of the second order.—(ED.)



(Acts xiv. 23) and St. Paul, upon passing on one occasion near Ephesus, where a church had been planted, sends for *the presbyters of the church*, and gives them this exhortation, *Take heed unto yourselves and to all the flock, over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers* (or bishops,\* *ἐπίσκοπους*) *to feed the church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood*, (Acts xx. 17, 28.)—In what the office of these presbyters then consisted, and how they were appointed, we can have no doubt. And we find from this passage, as well as from others to which we shall allude presently, that they then had the name of *Bishops* (*ἐπίσκοποι*) and I need hardly observe, that this, in no respect, militates against what we are now attempting to prove, because it is not the *Name*, but the *Thing*, for which we contend. They were *Overseers* of their particular flocks, and so are elsewhere said to preside (*προΐστασθαι*) over them (see 1 Thess. v. 12, and 1 Tim. v. 17), a word which is used also by Justin Martyr, with reference to the minister who officiated in the public congregation.†

4.—But our proof is, at present, no doubt, incomplete. Pass we on therefore to the Epistles of St. Paul to Timothy and Titus; and there, particularly in the former, we shall find clear and distinct evidence of that for which we are enquiring.

(1.) *TIMOTHY* was then stationed at Ephesus, where the presbyters or bishops were whom St. Paul had addressed as we have seen above; and from this epistle, we learn, that besides them (1 Tim. iii. 1 et seq.) there were also *deacons* (iii. 12 et seq.) respecting whom the apostle gives certain directions:—and, with the exception of the directions he gave to Timothy himself, *these are the only ecclesiastical orders or ranks of whom he speaks*: and to Timothy he gives such directions as these:—*AGAINST a PRESBYTER RECEIVE NOT AN ACCUSATION, but before two or three witnesses. Them that sin REBUKE BEFORE ALL, that others also may fear. I charge thee before God and the Lord Jesus Christ, and the elect angels, that thou observe these things, without preferring one before another, doing nothing by partiality. LAY HANDS SUD- DENLY ON NO MAN, (v. 19—22.) He is to charge some that they teach no other doctrine than what the apostle had taught, (i. 3) and the directions of the apostles, as to the character of the presbyters and deacons is given, that he might know how to act in the church, (iii. 15.)* Here then is clearly one of an order or rank,

---

\* In Scripture, the term *BISHOP* means a *PRESBYTER* or the second order of the priesthood; but *out of Scripture*, it means that higher sacerdotal order which is found in Scripture under the title of '*APOSTLE*.'—The Christian father Theodoret, who died about the year 460, states, as a known fact, that 'they formerly called the same persons *Presbyters and Bishops*, and those that are now called *Bishops*, they named *Apostles*:—but afterwards they left the name of the Apostleship to those that were truly Apostles, and gave the name of the Episcopate to those who were before called Apostles.'—(See Theodoret, in Ep. I. ad Tim. iii. 1. Op. Tom. 3, p. 652. Ed. Schulz, 1769.)—Probably the name, *Apostle*, was used only to denote those whom the apostles themselves had appointed to the presidency of the churches.—(Ed.)

† He calls him *The President*—Ο προεστως.

distinct from that of the presbyters and deacons, a president or pastor, or, as we now call it, Bishop of the Presbyters and Deacons.'

(2.) In the Epistle to TITUS we read as follows:—'*For this cause left I thee in Crete, that thou shouldest SET IN ORDER the things that are wanting and ORDAIN PRESBYTERS in every city, as I had appointed thee: if any be blameless, &c.,* for a bishop must be blameless as the steward of God, &c. (Titus i. 5 et seq.) *There are many unruly and vain talkers . . . whose mouths MUST BE STOPPED, . . . wherefore REBUKE them sharply,* (i. 10—13.) *A man that is an heretic, after the first and second admonition, REJECT,* (iii. 10.)—Here then we find Titus commissioned by the apostle to perform the same duties at Crete, as Timothy was at Ephesus.'

'And these directions to Timothy and Titus become doubly forcible in proof of the point in question, when we compare them with the language of the apostle to churches where no such president appears to have been appointed; as, for instance, the Corinthian, to which the apostle says,—*The rest will I set in order when I come,* (1 Cor. xi. 34.)'

'5.—And as it respects the important point of Ordination, let us observe, that the language used in these epistles shows that it belonged exclusively to them (the presiding pastors) to ordain; not merely from the charge of ordination being expressly delivered to them alone, but from the power given them over the presbyters, which renders it absurd to suppose that the presbyters there might of themselves appoint others to be presbyters, and thus have the power of introducing any teachers they pleased into the church.—By what particular NAME these presidents of the churches were then known, is a question of comparatively little moment. There is some evidence, however, in favour of their having had the title of Apostles.—That several besides the twelve had this title is clear, (see Rom. xvi. 7, &c.); and the phrase Apostles of the Churches, (αποστολοι εκκλησιων) occurs in 2 Cor. viii. 23,—a phrase which not improbably designated those who had been appointed by the apostles, who bore the immediate commission of our Lord, to have the chief superintendence of those churches; and thus St. Paul, when writing to the Philippians, calls Epaphroditus their Apostle, (see Phil. ii. 25, υμων αποστολον, our translators have rendered it Messenger, as in 2 Cor. viii. 23.)—We may observe, therefore, that in this Epistle to the Philippians, we have another remarkable testimony to the position, that the clergy then consisted of three orders, corresponding to those which have been received in all episcopal churches. For this epistle is addressed by the apostle to the saints at Philippi, with the Bishops and Deacons, (Phil. i. 1,) which shows that these were the only orders of ministers then present at Philippi, to whom, however, we are to add Epaphroditus, their Apostle, who was then with St. Paul, having been sent to him by the church at Philippi, (Phil. iv. 18,) and who returned to Philippi with St. Paul's letter, (ii. 25, et seq., &c.)—In the Book of Revelation also we find them (the presiding pastors) spoken of . . . under the name of The Angel of the Church, over which

‘they presided; \* a name very similar in meaning to that of Apostle, —and in the writings immediately succeeding the apostolical times, we find such persons known by the name of *Bishops of the Churches*; but all with which we are here concerned is *the office itself*,—and for that, as we have seen, we have in the Epistles to Timothy and Titus, clear and distinct proof.’

‘6.—And besides these three orders, *we read of no others being appointed by the apostles*; for the other names we meet with, as *prophet, &c.*, are not descriptive of persons set apart by the apostles to fulfil certain duties, but of those who had received an extraordinary gift of the Holy Spirit, such as the name imported.—The *Standing Ministry* of the church consisted of the three orders only; but in the infancy of the church it pleased God to qualify many others in a peculiar way, to take a part in the work of spiritual instruction.—And this may, in a great measure, account for the apparent exercise of parts of the ministerial office by those who did not belong to any of the three orders at this period; and should make others, who are apt to plead their example, somewhat more cautious of an unnecessary interference with the ministerial function.’

‘7.—Having, then, thus found in *Scripture*, distinct evidence for the apostolical institution of these three orders in the ministry, we appeal further to the *Practice* of the earliest times of the church, as testified to us by those who were *eye-witnesses* of it, to give to any who may be unconvinced by the evidence of Scripture, . . . additional proof that our views of the matter are correct:—but it is upon Scripture that we rely for the proof of the Apostolicity of these three orders.’ †

---

\* The name ANGEL, in our Lord’s address to the seven churches of Asia, evidently applies to *one individual*, who is recognized as the chief or president of each church.—To understand the churches themselves by the name *Angels*, is to contradict the Scriptures; for we are told (Rev. i. 20) ‘the seven candlesticks are the seven churches:’—indeed, the foreign divine, *Scultetus*, who died in 1626, says, ‘All the most learned interpreters, by *angels* expound the bishops, nor can it be otherwise interpreted without violence to the text.’ (Obs. on Tit. in *Confess.* p. 47.)—*Luther* also confesses, ‘We have scriptural authority for Episcopacy’ (Hos. ii. 2); and *Calvin* likewise acknowledges, on Titus i. 5, ‘We learn hence that there was not an equality among the ministers of the church; but that *one* was, with authority, placed over others.’—The fact probably is, that as there were several pastors at Ephesus, in the lifetime of St. Paul (Acts xx. 17, 28), so were there in all the other Asiatic churches, at the time St. John addressed the Epistles to them.—These epistles or letters were accordingly sent to *one person* in each church—(the Angel, or Bishop)—because *one person* in each church occupied a pre-eminent function.—(Ed.)

† See “*The Divine Rule of Faith and Practice*,” &c. by Wm. Goode, M.A. Trin. Coll. Cambridge, Rector of St. Antholin, London, Vol. 2. pp. ~~61–65~~



## MODERATION OF THE ENGLISH CHURCH IN HER ECCLESIASTICAL POLITY.

THE founders of the Reformed English Church, in the construction of her Articles, carefully abstained from confounding that which is right and useful to the *well-being* of a church with that which is necessary to its *existence*. To them, the Threefold order of Bishops, Priests and Deacons, appeared to be sound and scriptural, and of apostolic origin; but they *did not, on this account, assume that there could be no church without them.*—The English reformers, it is true, have spoken in the Articles distinctly *for the guidance of their own church*: but it is not true that they have passed judgment upon other churches, which, from various circumstances, were led to differ from them in their ecclesiastical polity.—In confirmation of this view of the moderation and charity of the reformed English church, it may be observed that, during the Marian persecutions, many of the most zealous supporters of the British Reformation fled for shelter to Frankfort, Strasburgh and Zurich, the chief places of refuge to the ministers of the reformed faith, and, upon their return to their own country, on the accession of Elizabeth, *not fewer than eight of these refugees were selected for the vacant bishoprics, (viz.)*—Jewell, Grindall, Coxe, Pilkington, Sandys, Parkhurst, Horn and Bentham; and several of them assisted in settling the Articles and Liturgy, in 1562.—It is well known also that all these men, during their exile, had been thrown into much intercourse with *Calvin, Bullinger, Gualter, Peter Martyr, Simler*, and other leading reformers of the continental churches; and indeed, after their appointment to the English bishoprics, the closest ties of Christian affection continued to subsist between them to the end of life,\*—an historical *fact* which serves to show that, if the private views of any of the reformers had been inclined to be exclusive, *these eight prelates would not have suffered such a spirit to have been infused into Articles which awaited their sanction.*

---

### ARTICLES ON CHURCH GOVERNMENT CONSIDERED, VIZ.:—XIX. XX. XXIII. XXXVI.

1.—The 19th Article states:—‘*The visible church of Christ is a congregation of faithful men, in the which the pure word of God is preached, and the Sacraments be duly ministered according to Christ’s ordinance, in all things that, of necessity, are requisite to the same.*’

The definition of a church here given is clear and simple, and the term ‘*church*’ was obviously intended, by the compilers of our Articles, to be applied to any *individual society*, such as the church of England or any other church;—for at the close of this very

---

\* See *Zurich Letters*, Parker Society edit. 1842.

Article (the 19th), particular allusion is made to the *single churches of Jerusalem, Alexandria, and Antioch.\**

2.—The 20th Article asserts:—‘*The church hath power to decree Rites or Ceremonies, and authority in Controversies of Faith.*’ †

Of course the term *church* spoken of in this Article is to be understood in the same sense as that taken in the preceding Article, that is, as an individual society or *single church*, such as Jerusalem, &c.; and such a church, this Article declares, has *authority* over her own members in any disputes which may arise upon doctrinal points. This ‘*authority*’ consists in interfering upon such occasions—in pronouncing judgment, and in holding her members bound not publicly to contradict it; but neither any single church, nor any multiplication of single churches, can *dictate* what shall be believed by the individuals who compose the society.—In ‘controversies of faith,’ the church of that nation, no doubt, ‘*hath power*’ solemnly to record her judgment, and this judgment ought to have the utmost weight: but, (as Bishop Burnet remarks on this Article—the 20th) ‘*if after all possible methods of enquiry a man cannot master his thoughts, or make them agree with the public decisions, his conscience is not under bonds, since this authority is not absolute nor grounded upon a promise of infallibility.*’

3.—In the Preface to the Ordination Services, the church declares:—‘*It is evident unto all men diligently reading Holy Scripture and ancient authors, that from the apostles’ time there have been these orders of ministers in Christ’s church—Bishops, Priests, and Deacons.*’ ‡ It

---

\* The form of *Bidding Prayer* enjoined on the clergy in the Canons of 1603 (the 55th) runs thus: ‘Ye shall pray for Christ’s Holy Catholic Church, that is, for the whole congregation of Christian people dispersed throughout the whole world; and especially for the Churches of England, Scotland, and Ireland.’—We observe, that in this Canon, the church of Scotland, as well as the church of England and other churches, without reference to any particular form of government, are viewed as so many different parts of Christ’s universal church.

† The remaining part of the 20th Article states: ‘And yet it is not lawful for the church to ordain anything that is contrary to God’s Word written: neither may it so expound one place of Scripture that it be repugnant to another. Wherefore, although the Church be a witness and a keeper of Holy Writ, yet as it ought not to decree anything against the same, so besides the same ought it not to enforce anything to be believed for necessity of salvation.’

‡ Dr. Hawkins, in a sermon preached before the University of Oxford in 1842, on “*The Nature and Obligation of Apostolic Order*,” remarks:—‘It should be carefully observed that we are scarcely at all concerned with any other than the latest form of Apostolic order—that which the apostles at the close of their ministry bequeathed to the church for ever. . . . The miraculous gifts, the community of goods, the daily attendance in the Jewish temple, the communion celebrated from house to house, were all of them, we know, adapted to local and temporary emergencies. . . . What St. Paul and St. John bequeathed to the church, at their departure—that, we might presume, if any, would be the form of order designed for perpetuity, adapted, as it would be, to the ordinary and enduring condition of the church. . . . To many pious minds (to most, perhaps, until they have paid some distinct attention to the question) it has appeared that

is certain, therefore, that the reformed English church deems this threefold ministry essential to *the well-being* of a church, that is, for the preservation of the truth—for the extension of Christ's church—for its harmonious government, and for the edification of its members: but she does not declare that this threefold ministry is essential to the *being* of a church.—In her Articles there is a marked silence upon this point—a circumstance exceedingly significant.

4.—The English church also, in her 23rd Article, maintains—*'That it is not lawful for any man to take upon him the office of public preaching, or ministering the sacraments in the congregation, before he be lawfully called and sent to execute the same:'* and in the 36th Article, she defines, in a very precise and unreserved manner, what constitutes a lawful minister *within her own pale*; stating, *'That whosoever are consecrated or ordered, according to the rites of the Book of Consecration, &c., set forth in the time of Edward the Sixth, we decree to be rightly, orderly, and lawfully consecrated and ordered.'* But when the Church of England defines what constitutes a lawful minister in the abstract, she carefully abstains from asserting that the apostolical order is essential to the existence of a church; and in her 23rd Article uses very general expressions, simply observing, —*'Those we ought to judge lawfully called and sent which be chosen and called to this work by men who have public authority given unto them in the congregation, to call and send ministers into the Lord's vineyard.'* Here our reformers stopped, and here too we must stop. The rule for our own guidance is made clear by the church, but any inferences respecting others are gratuitous and a manifest departure from the moderation of our church.—Bishop Burnet remarks, on this part of the 23rd Article,—*'The definition here given of those that are lawfully called and sent is put in very general words, far from that magisterial stiffness in which some have taken upon them to speak in this matter.'*\* Indeed, the terms of this Article are so general

*'whatever form of order is indeed of apostolic origin, must therefore be of absolute and indefeasible obligation—essential to the very being of a church: and so it would be, provided also it could be shown that the apostles not only sanctioned the institution, but enacted and declared its perpetual obligation—otherwise, although it was evidently once the best, because it was appointed by them, it may not be the best under all possible circumstances:—and not to admit this distinction is, I apprehend, to lose sight of the necessary difference between an Ordinance and a Doctrine—between a Truth which of its own nature is eternal, and an Institution which is of its own nature mutable.'*—The latest form of apostolic order discoverable in the Scriptures is the threefold order of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons: and evident traces of the universal adoption of this form of church government are to be found, both in the age immediately succeeding that of the apostles, and for the first fifteen centuries of the Christian era.

\* Bishop Burnet also on this part of the 23rd Article (speaking of those who are lawfully called and sent) further observes: *'The Article does not resolve this into any particular constitution, but leaves the matter open and at large for such accidents as had happened and such as might still happen.—They who drew it had the state of the several churches before their eyes that had been differently reformed: and although their own had been less forced to go out of the beaten path than any other, yet they knew that all things among themselves had not gone according to those rules that ought*



and so comprehensive, and (as Dr. Hawkins has observed) ‘are so framed and *cautiously* guarded, that (excluding indeed the ministry of self-appointed teachers, which would be destructive of all order and overthrow the very nature of a Christian society) they apply to any church, and the ministry of any church: nay, might even apply to congregations of separatists, who had *conscientious grounds* for *their separation*.’ \*

## Fathers of the English Church.

### TYNDAL,

Martyr, 1536, published his work entitled “*The Obedience of a Christian Man, &c.*” in 1528. †

1.—He describes the process of papal domination over Christ and earthly potentates in the following striking terms:—‘Forasmuch as Christ is as great as Peter, why is not *His* seat as great as *Peter’s*? . . . . It is verily as Paul saith, (2 Cor. 11,) *The false apostles are deceitful workers, and fashion themselves like unto the apostles of Christ*, that is, the *shaven nation* ‡ preached Christ falsely, yea, under the name of *Christ* preached *themselves*, and reign in Christ’s stead—(they) have also taken away the key of knowledge, and have wrapped the people in ignorance, and have taught them to believe *in themselves, in their traditions and false ceremonies, so that Christ is but a vain name*. And, after they had put Christ out of his room, they got themselves to the emperor and kings, and so long ministered their business, *till they have also put them out of their rooms and have got their authorities from them, and reign also in their stead*,—so that the emperor and kings are but *vain names and shadows*, as Christ is, having nothing to do in the world. *Thus reign they, in the stead of God and man, and have all power under them and do what they lust.*’ (Fol. 50.)

‘to be sacred in regular times.—Necessity has no law, and is a law to itself. . . . . We are very sure that not only those who penned the Articles, but the body of the church for above half an age after did, notwithstanding those irregularities, acknowledge the foreign churches so constituted to be true churches, as to all the essentials of a church, though they had been at first irregularly formed, and continued still to be in an imperfect state: and therefore the general words in which this part of the Article is framed seemed to have been designed on purpose not to exclude them. . . . . Neither our reformers, nor their successors, for near eighty years after those Articles were published, did ever question the constitution of such churches.’

\* See Hawkins’ *Sermon on the Apostolical Succession*, preached on the consecration of the Bishop of Chichester, 1842, and printed at the command of His Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury.

† The following words are on the title-page of this work: ‘The Obedyence of a Chrysten Man: and howe Chrysten Rulers ought to governe, wherin also (yf thou marke dilygently) thou shalte fynde eyes to perceyve the craftye conveyance of all Jugglers.’

‡ Tyndal alludes to the tonsure of the *Romish priests*.

2.—On the *Duties of Christian Kings and Christian Subjects*, under this wretched state of captivity, Tyndal observes:—‘ Though as I before have sufficiently proved, a Christian man must suffer all thing, be it never so great unright, as long as it is not against God’s commandment:—neither is it lawful for him to cast any burden off his back by his own authority, till God pull it off, which laid it on for our deservings; yet ought the kings everywhere to defend their realms from such oppression, if they were Christian, which is seldom seen, and is an hard thing verily, though not impossible.— For alas! *they be captives* or ever they be kings, yea, almost ere they be born. No man may be suffered about them but flatterers, and such as are first sworn true unto our most holy fathers, the bishops, that is to say, *false to God and man*. If any of the nobles of the realm be true to the king, and so bold that he dare counsel him that which should be to his honour and for the wealth of the realm, they will wait a season for him, (as men say) they will provide a ghostly father for him. God bring their wickedness to light!—There is no mischief whereof they are not the root, nor blood shed but through their cause—either by their counsel, or in that they preach not true obedience and teach not the people to fear God. . . . The kings ought, I say, to remember that they are *in God’s stead*, and ordained of God, not for themselves, but for the wealth of their subjects. Let them remember that their subjects are their brethren, their flesh and blood, members of their own body, and even their own selves in Christ. Therefore ought they to pity them, and to rid them from such wily tyranny which increaseth more and more daily. And though that the kings (by the falsehood of the bishops and abbots) be sworn to defend such liberties, yet ought they not to keep their oaths, but to break them; forasmuch as they are unright and clean against God’s ordinance, and even but cruel oppression, contrary unto brotherly love and charity. Moreover, the spiritual officer ought to punish no sin, but and if any sin break out, the king is ordained to punish it, and they not; but to preach and exhort them to fear God, and that they sin not.’ (Fol. 66.)

3.—After mentioning the authority which Christ gave his apostles as to the *right of binding and loosing*, (Matt. xvi. 19; xxviii. 18, 19, 20), Tyndal remarks: ‘ Christ’s authority which he gave to his disciples, was to preach the law and to bring sinners to repentance, and then to preach unto them the promises which the Father had made unto all men, for his sake: and the same to preach only sent he his apostles—as a king sendeth forth his judges and giveth them his authority, saying, *What ye do, that do I: I give you my full power*: yet meaneth he not by that *full power*, that they should destroy any town or city, or oppress any man, or do what they list, or should reign over the lords and dukes of his realm, and over his ownself:—but giveth them a law with them, and authority to bind and loose, as far forth as the law stretcheth and maketh mention—that is, to punish the evil that do wrong, and to avenge the poor that suffer wrong. And so far as the law stretcheth will the king defend his judge against all men. And *as the temporal judges*

'bind and loose temporally, so do the priests spiritually, and no other ways:—howbeit by falsehood and subtlety the pope reigneth under Christ, as cardinals and bishops do under kings—*lawless*. (Fol. 86.)

4.—This reformer also, while speaking of '*Confession*,' writes as follows: 'The bishops, with the pope, have a certain conspiracy and secret treason against the whole world: and, by confession, know they what kings and emperors *think*. If aught be against them (do they never so evil) then move they their captives to war and to fight, and give them pardons to slay whom they will have taken out of the way. They have, with falsehood, taken from all kings and emperors their right and duties, which now they call their freedoms, liberties, and privileges, and have perverted the ordinances that God left in the world, and have made every king swear to defend their falsehood against their own selves. So that now if any man preach God's word truly, and shew the freedom and liberty of the soul, which we have in Christ, or intend to restore the kings again unto their duties and right, and to the room and authority which they have of God, and of shadows to make them kings indeed, and to put the world in his order again: then the kings deliver their swords and authority unto the hypocrites to slay him. So drunken are they with the wine of the whore.—The text that followeth in Paul will they haply lay to my charge and others, *How shall they preach except they be sent?* saith Paul in the said 10th chap. to the Romans. *We will!*—they say, . . . . *the pope, cardinals, and bishops, all authority is ours. The Scripture pertaineth unto us, and is our possession:—and we have a law that whosoever presume to preach without the authority of the bishops, is excommunicate in the deed doing. Whence therefore hast thou thine authority?* will they say. The old Pharisees had the Scripture in captivity likewise, and asked Christ, *By what authority doest thou these things?* as who should say, We are Pharisees, and thou art none of our order, nor hast authority of us. Christ asked them another question (and so will I do our hypocrites)—*Who sent you?* God?—Nay. *He that is sent of God speaketh God's word.* (John iii.) Now speak ye not God's word, nor anything save your own laws, made clean contrary unto God's word.—Christ's apostles preached Christ, and not themselves. He that is of the truth preacheth the truth. Now ye preach nothing but lies; and therefore are of the devil, the father of all lies, and *of him are ye sent.*—And as for mine authority, or who sent me, I report me unto my works, as Christ. (John v. and x.) *If God's word bear record that I say truth, why should any man doubt but that God, the Father of truth and of light, hath sent me, as the father of lies and of darkness hath sent you: and that the Spirit of truth and of light is with me, as the spirit of lies and of darkness is with you?*—By this means, thou wilt that every man be a preacher, will they say: *Nay verily:* for God will that not, and therefore will I it not; no more than I would that every man of London were Mayor of London, or every man of the realm king thereof. *God is not the author of dissension and strife, but of unity and peace and of good order.* I will therefore, that where a congregation is gathered together in Christ, one be chosen after



the rule of Paul, and that he only preach; and else no man openly.' (Fol. 93, 94.)

5.—And, as '*an example of false expounding the Scriptures,*' Tyndal notices:—'Matt. xvi. When Peter saith to Christ, *Thou art the Son of the living God*: and Christ answered, *Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my congregation*.—By the rock interpret they Peter: and then cometh the pope, and will be Peter's successor, whether Peter will or will not—yea, whether God will or will not—and though all the Scripture say nay, to any such succession, and saith, *Lo! I am the Rock, the Foundation and Head of Christ's church*. . . . John xv. Christ is the vine and we the branches; so is *Christ the rock*, the stock and foundation whereon we be built. And Paul (1 Cor. iii.) calleth *Christ our foundation*, and all other (whether it be Peter or Paul) he calleth our *servants* to preach Christ and to build us on him. If, therefore, the pope be Peter's successor, his duty is to preach Christ only, *and other authority hath he none.*' (Fol, 119.)

See Tyndall's "Obedyence of a Chrysten Man, prynted at Malborowe, in the lande of Hesse, 1528."

### LAMBERT, Martyr, 1538.

1.—In his answer to the 43rd Article, exhibited against him by Archbishop Warham and other papists, in or about the year 1532, Lambert says:—'You ask whether I believe that St. Peter was Christ's vicar, having power on earth to bind and loose.—I say, . . . that Christ made *all the apostles of equal honour and like authority*; notwithstanding, because he would testify the unity of his church or congregation, he spake, as it were, only unto Peter, when he said, *feed my sheep*, and *I shall give thee, Peter, the keys of heaven!* But, in so saying, though the words seem spoken to Peter only, yet they were spoken unto him, in that *he sustained the general person of all the church, being, as it were, a common speaker for the same*; so that in speaking to him, *Christ spake unto all other the apostles*; unto whom also he gave all the same authority that he gave unto Peter.'

2.—And in his reply to the 44th Article brought against him, Lambert remarks:—'You ask whether I believe that the pope . . . be the successor of Peter? I say, . . . The pope may succeed in St. Peter's stead or office, and do the same, duly and diligently feeding Christ's flock, and showing virtuous example of living to the same; and, so doing, he may and ought to be thought and named *a true successor of St. Peter*: and thus is your lordship St. Peter's successor, *performing the conditions aforesaid*, with other like properties requisite to your order and duty; yea, and as many others as do truly their duty, and duly the office of a bishop; otherwise, may not the pope be called *the successor of Peter*, . . . but the contrary. . . . For what should men call those Peter's successors that play the pageants (pagans), and follow with the conditions of Caiaphas, Simon Magus,

‘or Judas? Such verily, if any be, cannot rightly claim to be Peter’s successors, no more than the night may claim to be successor of the day, for *Peter was never so minded, nor taught them so.*’—(Foxe’s *Acts and Monuments*, &c., 8vo. ed. 1838, Vol. 5, pp. 221—224.)

## C R A N M E R,

Archbishop of Canterbury in 1533,—Martyr, 1555.

In the early part of the reformation, a book was published by the authority of the King, Council, and Convocation, entitled, “A necessary Doctrine and Erudition for any Christian Man.”\* The first edition of this work was chiefly a compilation from the Confession of Augsburgh and other writings of the Lutheran divines; but in the last edition, the doctrine of justification was corrupted with the Romish leaven, through the influence of Gardiner with the king. To guard against this error, Cranmer published his “Annotations upon the King’s Book;” but these Annotations do not affect any sentiment advanced in the following extracts. It is true, the mind of Cranmer and the other reformers was far from being emancipated from papal errors at this time.†—Strype justly remarks, ‘*The sun of truth was now but rising and breaking through the thick mists of that idolatry, superstition, and ignorance which had so long prevailed.*’ One thing, however, which the Protestant reformers now distinctly saw, was *the usurpation of the church of Rome*; and in protesting against this abomination, their views on the subject of ecclesiastical polity are clearly unfolded.

1.—Upon one of the Articles of the apostles’ creed, “The Holy Catholic Church,” it is stated in this work:—‘Forsomuch as God of his goodness calleth people, as afore, without exception of persons or privilege of place, therefore his holy church is also *Catholic*, that is to say, not limited to any one place or region of the world, but is *in every place universally through the world, where it pleaseth God to call people to him, in the profession of Christ’s name and faith, be it in Europe, Africa, or Asia*;—and all these churches in divers countries severally called, although for knowledge of the one from the other, among them they have divers

---

\* During the struggles between the principles of Protestantism and Popery in the reign of Henry VIII. (Cranmer and Gardiner being the leaders of their respective parties) three editions of this work were published. The first edition was printed in 1537, under the title of “*The Godly and Pious Institution of a Christian Man*,” and being dedicated by the bishops to the king, was called “*The Bishops’ Book*.”—The second edition, with some enlargements and alterations, came out in 1540; and the third edition appeared in 1543, entitled, “*A Necessary Doctrine and Erudition for any Christian Man*.” This book was addressed by the king to his people, and was therefore called “*The King’s Book*.” In the preface, Henry asserts his supremacy under the following dedication:—‘Henry the Eyght, by the Grace of God Kyng of Englande, France, and Irelande, Defendour of the Faythe, and in Earthe, of the Churche of Englande and also of Irelande, supreme Head,—unto all his faythfull and lovyng Subjectes sendeth gretynge.’

† See Cranmer’s own candid confession, quoted in the note on page 41.

additions of names ; and for their most necessary government, as they be distinct in places, so they have *distinct ministers and divers heads* in earth, governors and rulers—yet be *all these holy churches but ONE HOLY CHURCH CATHOLIC*. . . . Whereby it appeareth, that the unity of these holy churches in sundry places assembled, standeth not by acknowledging of one governor in earth over all churches, for neither the whole church catholic together, nor any particular church apart, is bound to acknowledge any one universal governor over the whole church other than Christ, although by sufferance of some princes and potentates, (not being truly instructed in the word of God by such as of duty both to God and them, ought to have declared the truth of Scripture to them) and by hypocrisy and usurpation of the see and court of Rome, the bishop of the same, *giving himself more to worldly policy than to the execution of his duty*, hath long time gone about to obtain and establish unto himself such an universal authority, and hath, by abuses, always compassed to cause other to uphold and maintain the same, *contrary to God's law*. . . . The unity, therefore, of the church is not conserved by the bishop of Rome's authority or doctrine, but the unity of the catholic church, which all Christian men in this article do profess, is conserved and kept by the help and assistance of the Holy Spirit of God, *in retaining and maintaining of such doctrine and profession of Christian faith, and true observance of the same as is taught by the Scripture and the doctrine apostolic*.—And particular churches ought not, in the said doctrine so accepted and allowed, to vary one from another for any lucre, arrogance, or any other worldly affection ; but inviolably to observe the same, so that by reason of that doctrine, each church that teacheth the same, may be worthily called (as it is in deed) an *Apostolic Church*—that is to say, *following such teaching as the apostles preached, with ministration of such sacraments as be approved by the same*.—And this unity of the holy church of Christ is not divided by distance of place *nor by diversity of traditions and ceremonies, diversely observed in divers churches for good order of the same*. For the church of Corinth and of Ephesus were one church in God, though the one were far distant in place from the other ; and though also in traditions, opinions and policies, there was some diversity among them : likewise as the Church of England, Spain, Italy, and Poole (Poland) be not separate from the unity, but be one church in God, notwithstanding that among them there is great distance of place, *diversity of traditions, not in all things unity of opinions, alteration in rites, ceremonies and ordinances*, or estimation of the same ; as one church, peradventure, doth esteem their rites, traditions, laws, ordinances and ceremonies to be of more virtue and efficacy than another church doth esteem the same. . . . But such *diversity in opinions, and other outward manners and customs of policy, doth not dissolve and break the unity*, which is in one God, one faith, one doctrine of Christ and his Sacraments, preserved and kept in these several churches, without any superiority or pre-



'eminence that one church, by God's law, may or ought to challenge  
'over another.\* And therefore the church of Rome, being but a  
'several church, challenging that name of *Catholic* above all other,  
'doth great wrong to all other churches, and doth, only by *force and*  
'*maintenance, support an unjust usurpation*; for that church hath no  
'more right to that name than the church of France, Spain, England  
'or Portugal, which be justly called *Catholic Churches*, in that they  
'do profess consent, and agree in *one* unity of true faith with other  
'catholic churches. . . . It is to be noted, that this Church  
'of England and other known particular churches in which Christ's  
'name is truly honoured, called on and professed in faith and bap-  
'tism, be members of *the whole Catholic Church*, and each of them,  
'by himself, is also worthily called *A Catholic Church*, when they  
'*merely profess and teach the faith and religion of Christ according to*  
'*the Scripture* and the apostolic doctrine.—And so *every Christian*  
'*man ought to honour, give credence, and to follow the particular church*  
'*of that region so ordered (as afore) wherein he is born or inhabiteth*:  
'and as all Christian people, *as well spiritual as temporal*, be bound  
'to believe, honour and obey our Saviour Jesus Christ, the only  
'head of the universal church, so likewise they be, by his command-  
'ment, bound to honour and obey, *next unto himself, Christian Kings*  
'*and Princes*, which be the head governors under him in the particu-  
'lar churches; to whose office it appertaineth not only to provide  
'for the tranquillity and wealth of their subjects, in temporal and  
'worldly things to the conservation of their bodies, *but also to foresee*  
'*that, within their dominions, such ministers be ordained and appointed*  
'*in their churches as can and will truly and purely set out the true*  
'*doctrine of Christ and teach the same, and to see the commandments of*  
'*God well observed and kept, to the wealth and salvation of their souls.*'

2.—And, "On the Sacrament of Orders," (after citing 2 Timothy i. 6, and 2 Timothy iv. 14, in proof 'that St. Paul did consecrate and  
'order priests and bishops by the imposition of his hands,' and also  
quoting Titus i. 5, and 1 Timothy v. 22, in proof that, 'as the  
'Apostles themselves in the beginning of the church did order priests and  
'bishops, so they appointed and willed the other Bishops after them to do  
'the like,') it is further remarked:—'And here is to be noted, that  
'although this form before declared is to be observed in giving  
'orders, yet there is no certain rule prescribed or limited by the word of  
'God for the Nomination, Election, Presentation, or Appointing of any

---

\* Cranmer, in his Catechism set forth in 1548, says,—'The company of  
'men which believeth the gospel, *although here, upon earth, they be severed in*  
'*sundry places*, yet are they called *One Holy Catholic or Universal Church of*  
'*Christ*, that is to say, a multitude, congregation, or company of Christian  
'people.—For this word *Church* doth not here betoken a temple or church  
'builded of timber and stone, but it signifieth a company of men lightened  
'with the Spirit of Christ, which do receive the gospel, and come together to  
'hear God's Word and to pray. And this Christian church is a *Communion*  
'*of Saints*, that is to say, all that be of this communion or company be holy,  
'and be one holy body under Christ their head.'—(*Fathers of the English*  
*Church*, Vol. 3, pp. 235, 236.)

*such Ecclesiastical Ministers;—but the same is wholly left unto the*  
 POSITIVE LAWS AND ORDINANCES OF EVERY CHRISTIAN REGION,  
 provided and made, or to be made in that behalf, WITH THE  
 ASSENT OF THE PRINCE AND RULER.'

3.—“Touching the Order of Deacons,” reference is made in this book to Acts vi., as proving ‘that they were ordered and instituted by the apostles, by prayer and imposition of their hands upon them,’—and after stating, that ‘of these *Two Orders only*, (that is to say, priests and deacons) Scripture maketh express mention;’—and then noticing the decrees of ‘the most ancient and most famous general councils,’—observing that, from them ‘it plainly appeareth that the bishops of Rome, claiming pretended universal primacy, do it, not only without any ground of Holy Scripture, and without any consent of the holy catholic church, but also contrary to the determinations and decrees of such general councils,’—the book in question then proceeds in the following words:—‘The truth is, that God constituted and ordained the authority of Christian kings and princes to be the most high and supreme above all other powers and officers in this world in the regiment and government of their people, and committed unto them, as unto the chief heads of their commonwealths, the cure and oversight of all the people which be in their realms and dominions, without any exception.—And to them of right, and by God’s commandment belongeth, not only to prohibit unlawful violence, to correct offenders by corporal death or other punishment, to conserve moral honesty among their subjects according to the laws of their realms, to defend justice, and to procure the public weal and common peace and tranquillity in outward and earthly things;—but specially and principally to *defend the faith of Christ and his religion, to conserve and maintain the true doctrine of Christ, and all such as be true preachers and setters-forth thereof, and to abolish all abuses, heresies and idolatries*, and to punish with corporal pains such as of malice be the occasion of the same; and finally *to oversee and cause that the said bishops and priests do execute their pastoral office truly and faithfully*, and specially in those points which, by Christ and his apostles, was given and committed unto them. . . . And God hath also commanded the said bishops and priests to obey, with all humbleness and reverence, both kings and princes, and governors, and all their laws, *not being contrary to the laws of God, whatsoever they be*, and that not only *propter iram* but also *propter conscientiam*, that is to say, not only for fear of punishment but also for discharge of conscience. Whereby it appeareth well that this pretended monarchy of the bishop of Rome is not founded upon the gospel, but it is repugnant thereunto.’—(See “*A Necessary Doctrine and Erudition for any Chrysten Man, set furth by the Kynge’s Majestye of Englande, &c.*” Printed by Thomas Berthelet, 1543,—pages not numbered.)

## BRADFORD,

Prebendary of St. Paul's—Martyr 1555,

In his "Talk" with the papist Harpsfield,\* remarks:—'You shall not find in all the Scripture this your essential part of succession of bishops. . . . The ministry of God's word and ministers be an essential point, but to translate this to the bishops and their succession is a plain subtilty. . . . Who yet will grant that Peter had a patrimony given for his heirs? He hath left (say the papists) to his successors the self-same right which he received. O Lord God! then must his successor be A SATAN, for he received that title of Christ himself! (Matt. xvi. 23.) I would gladly have the papists to shew me one place of succession mentioned in the Scriptures. . . . If they will needs have the bishop of Rome to be acknowledged for the head of the church, then will I urge them that they shall give us a *Bishop*; but they obtrude unto us a butcher, rather, or a bite-sheep, than a bishop.—They brag of Peter's succession, of Christ's vicar; this is always in their mouth: but alas! how can we call him Christ's vicar that resisteth Christ, oppugneth his verity, persecuteth his people, and, like a prelate, preferreth himself above God and man?'—(See Foxe's *Acts and Monuments*, &c., 8vo. ed. 1838, Vol. 7, pp. 170, 247, 248.)

## PHILPOT,

Archdeacon of Winchester—Martyr 1555,

Speaks thus:—'I deny that succession of bishops is an infallible point to know the church by; for there may be a succession of bishops known in a place and yet there be no church, as at Antioch and Jerusalem, and in other places where the apostles abode, as well as at Rome. But if you put to the succession of bishops *succession of doctrine* withal (as St. Augustine doth), I will grant it to be a good proof for the catholic church; but a *local succession is nothing available*. . . . I allow the church of Geneva and the doctrine of the same: for it is *Una, Catholica et Apostolica*, and doth follow the doctrine that the Apostles did preach; and the doctrine taught and preached in King Edward's days was also according to the same. . . . The church is a certain congregation of men *meddled* *eftsoons*, (that is, mingled from time to time) with good and evil, in the universal doctrine of Christ openly agreeing, and using his Sacraments righteously.—In this definition there is nothing wanting or abounding, nothing doubtfully put, neither excludeth hypocrites, either unclean persons, which to God alone be known, so that they do not deny the true doctrine and pass over their life quietly.'—(See "*Philpot's Examinations and Writings*," Parker Society ed. pp. 139, 153, 330.)

---

\* A persecuting Romanist, chaplain to Bonner, Bishop of London.



## H O O P E R,

Bishop of Gloucester, 1550—Martyr 1555.

1.—In a work entitled “A Declaration of Christ, and of His Office,” printed in 1547, in the fourth chapter “*Of the Authority of the Word of God*,” Hooper writes thus:—‘It is the office of a good man to teach the church as Christ taught, to revoke all errors and bring back such as err unto the fold of Christ, *only by the word of Christ*.—For the water at the fountain head is more wholesome and pure than when it is carried abroad in rotten pipes or stinking dishes. *I had rather follow the shadow of Christ than the body of all the general councils or doctors since the death of Christ*. The devil never slept, but always, by his ministers, attempted to destroy the verity of Christ’s religion, and clean to put out the light of truth, which was perfect in Christ’s time and in the time of the apostles—none since that time so pure. St. Jerome (*in vitâ Malchi*) saith, that his time was darkness in the respect of the apostles’ time. The antiquity of the world doth darken the verity of God’s word; as Varro saith the truth, *that age corrupteth and taketh away many things, and the third century doth not see the same man which the first saw*. . . . The church of God must therefore be bound to no other authority than unto the voice of the gospel and unto the ministry thereof. . . . And, seeing the church is bound unto this infallible truth, the only word of God, *it is a false and usurped authority that men attribute unto the clergy, and bind the word of God and Christ’s church to the succession of bishops, or any college of cardinals, schools, ministries, or cathedral churches*. Paul would have no man to give faith to any person or minister in the church of God, but when he preacheth the word of God truly, (Gal. i.) For the punishment of our sins God leaveth in all men great imperfection, and such as were endued with excellent wit and learning saw not always the truth. As it is to be seen in Basilius, Ambrose, Epiphanius, Austin, Bernard and others, though they stayed themselves in the knowledge of Christ, and erred not in any principal article of the faith; yet they did, *inordinately, and more than enough, extol the doctrine and tradition of men*. . . . Thus a little and a little the devil augmented superstition and diminished the truth of God’s glory, so that we see no where the church of Christ as it was in the apostles’ time; though many and godly verities have been brought unto light in our time by men of divers graces, yet is not the truth of necessary verities plainly shewed by them.—Lest man should too much glory in himself, he permitted them to err in certain points; as Luther, of blessed memory, who wrote and preached the gospel of justification, no man better; yet in the cause of the sacrament he erreth concerning the corporal presence of Christ’s natural body, that there is no man can err more. . . . It is no reproach of the dead man, but *mine opinion unto all the world, that the Scripture solely and the apostles’ church is to be*

'followed; and no man's authority, be he Austin, Tertullian, or either Cherubim or Seraphim.'

2.—In the eleventh chapter of this same work, "*Of Christ as a King*," Hooper writes thus:—'God governeth this church with his own laws only, and would his subjects to know him, to honour him and to obey him as he hath commanded in his law. Paul expresseth this law, (Rom. i.) *the gospel is the power of God unto salvation, to every one that believeth*; and Mark, *preach the Gospel to every creature*, (Mark xvi.) The only law whereunto this congregation is bound is, the gospel, as Christ saith, (John xiv.) *The Holy Spirit shall teach you all things which I have said unto you*.—Here Christ bindeth the apostles and all the church unto the things that he had taught them. This commonwealth of the true church is known by these two marks, THE PURE PREACHING OF THE GOSPEL and THE RIGHT USE OF THE SACRAMENTS. Thus proveth Paul (Eph. ii.) that the church is bound unto the Word of God,—upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets are ye built. . . . Of the right use of sacraments, it is taught in 1 Cor. xi., Mark xvi., Luke xxiv. and Matt. xxviii., which teach people to know the church by these signs.—THE TRADITIONS OF MEN and THE SUCCESSION OF BISHOPS TEACH WRONG.

3.—In a work also entitled "A Godly Confession and Protestation of the Christian Faith," printed 1550, this reformer affirms:—'These two marks—the true preaching of God's word and right use of the sacraments—declare what and where the true church is. . . . Unto the which church I would all Christian men should associate themselves, although there may happen to be some things to be desired in manners and discipline, for no church, as touching this part, can be absolutely perfect:—but where the doctrine is sound and no idolatry defended, that church is of God, as far as mortal men can judge,\* and where this doctrine and right use of the Sacraments be not, there is no church of Christ, though it seem never so holy.'

---

\* The historian Strype records the following Fact:—'The first bishops that were made, and who were but newly returned out of their exiles (as Coxe, Grindal, Horn, Sandys, Jewell, Parkhurst, Bentham) upon their first returns, before they entered upon their ministry, laboured all they could against receiving into the church the papistical habits, and that all the ceremonies should be clean laid aside; but they could not obtain it from the Queen and the Parliament, and the habits were enacted.—Then they consulted together what to do, being in some doubt whether to enter into their functions: but they concluded unanimously not to desert their ministry for some rites that, as they considered, were but a few and not evil in themselves, especially since the doctrine of the gospel remained pure and entire.'—(See *Annals*, I. i. 263.)—And in a letter written by Horn, Bishop of Winchester, to Gualter, one of the continental reformers, dated Farnham Castle, July 17, 1565, he thus expresses himself:—'We complied . . . lest our enemies should take possession of the places deserted by ourselves. . . . Since the papists are forming a secret and powerful opposition, I am of opinion that we ought to continue in the ministry, lest, if we desert and reject it upon such grounds, THEY INSINUATE THEMSELVES INTO OUR PLACES.'—(See *Zurich Letters*, pp. 142, 143.)—It were earnestly to be desired, in the fiery conflict through which the church of England is now passing, that all her spiritual

4.—And at the close of this Confession of Faith, Hooper adds : — ‘ I am sorry therefore, with all my heart, to see the church of Christ degenerated into a cruel policy. . . . Because the Holy Ghost was in St. Peter at Rome, and in many other godly men that have occupied bishoprics and dioceses, therefore the same gifts, *they say*, must needs follow in their successors, although indeed they be no more like in zeal nor diligence, than Peter to Judas, Balaam to Jeremy, Annas and Caiaphas to John and James.’ —(See *Fathers of the English Church*, Vol. 5, p. 121—124, 176, 177, 219, 223.)

## JEWELL,

Bishop of Salisbury, 1559—died 1571,

published in or about the year 1565, the “*Defence of his Apology for the Church of England*,” in reply to the papist Harding.

1.—In this work, speaking of *the Church of Christ*, Jewell says : — ‘ We believe that there is one Church of God, and that the same is not shut up (as in times past among the Jews) into some one corner or kingdom, but that it is catholic and universal, and dispersed throughout the whole world :—so that there is now no nation which may truly complain that they be shut forth and may not be one of the church and people of God :—and (we believe) that this church is the kingdom, the body and the spouse of Christ —that Christ alone is the *prince* of this kingdom—that Christ alone is the *head* of this body—and that Christ alone is the *bridegroom* of this spouse. . . . Furthermore, we believe, that there be divers degrees of ministers in the church, whereof some be *Deacons*, some *Priests*, some *Bishops*,\* to whom is committed the office to instruct the people, and the whole charge and setting forth of religion.’ Jewell affirms also that ‘ all the apostles (as Cyprian saith) were of like power among themselves, and the rest were the same that Peter was . . . and that it was said indifferently to them all, *feed ye*—indifferently to them all, *go into the whole world* —indifferently to them all, *teach ye the gospel*; . . . and as for the bishop of Rome, who now calleth all matters before himself alone, except he do his duty, as he ought to do—except he minister the sacraments, except he instruct the people, except he warn

---

ministers and members were disposed, *like these holy men of old*, to pass by all minor considerations and objections, and to keep the different posts assigned them; for it is becoming daily more and more evident, that the English church is the ground on which the great battle, for the preservation of the purity of the Reformed Faith throughout the world, is to be fought. Let every friend of Protestant truth, then, ‘lengthen her cords and strengthen her stakes’ as much as possible—remembering that retirement from her communion at the present crisis, is, to a considerable extent, a retirement from the field of conflict itself, and a surrender of the ark of God into the hands of enemies.

\* Jewell, in his observations on these distinctions in the Christian ministry, notices the parity of the sacerdotal character in presbyters and bishops.



‘them and teach them—we say, that he ought not, of right, once to be called a bishop, or so much as an elder. For a bishop (as saith Augustine) is a name of *labour* and not of *honour*, that the man that seeketh to have pre-eminence, and not to profit, may understand himself to be *no bishop*.’ Jewell then observes, ‘that neither the pope, nor any other worldly creature, can no more be *head of the whole church* or a *bishop over all*, than he can be the *bridegroom*, the *light*, the *salvation* and *life* of the church: for these privileges and names belong only to Christ, and be properly and only fit for him alone. No bishop of Rome did ever suffer himself to be called by such a proud name and title before Phocas,’ the emperor’s, time (who, as we know, by killing his own sovereign Mauritius, the emperor, did by a traiterous villany, aspire to the empire) which was about the 613th year after Christ was born.’ Jewell then proceeds to state, ‘The Council of Carthage did circumspectly provide that no bishop should be called either the highest bishop or chief priest,’ adding these words, ‘therefore since the bishop of Rome will, now a-days, so be called and challengeth unto himself an authority that is none of his:—besides that he doth plainly, contrary to the ancient councils and contrary to the old fathers—we believe that he doth give to himself (as it is written by his own companion Gregory) a *presumptuous*, a *prophane*, a *sacrilegious*, and *antichristian* name; that he is also *the king of pride*; that he is *Lucifer*, which preferreth himself before his brethren; that he hath forsaken the faith, and is the forerunner of antichrist.’ (pp. 80, 81, 85, 95, 97, 110—113, 116.)

2.—Jewell has also given us, in plain terms, his sentiments on the subject of *Apostolical Succession*: for (after maintaining that all things are to be done ‘comely’ in the church, and that ‘the minister ought lawfully, duly, and orderly to be preferred to that office of the church of God, and that no man hath power to wrest himself into the holy ministry at his own pleasure’) he speaks thus—‘If it were certain that the religion and truth of God passeth evermore orderly by succession, and none otherwise, then were succession, whereof he (Mr. Harding) hath told us so long a tale, a very good substantial argument of the truth: but Christ saith, *by order of succession, the Scribes and Pharisees sit in Moses’ chair*. Annas and Caiaphas, touching succession, were as well bishops as Aaron and Eleazer. . . . When Christ began to reform their (the Scribes’ and Pharisees’) abuses and errors, they said unto him, *By what power doest thou these things? And who gave thee this authority? Where is thy succession?* Upon which words Beza saith,—*They would have the people understand* (for that he had no solemn succession) *that all that he did was of the devil*. And Cyril frameth their words in this sort,—*Thou, being of the tribe of Judah* (and therefore having no right by succession unto the priesthood) *takest upon thee the office that is committed unto us*. Likewise Chrysostom imagineth the Pharisees thus to say,—*Thou art not of the house of priests! The council hath not granted it thee! The emperor hath not given it thee!* Thus, to maintain themselves in credit (for that they had succession and continuance from Aaron, and sat in Moses’

chair) they kept Christ quite out of possession, and said unto him then, even as Mr. Harding saith now unto us, *Who ever taught us these things before thee? What ordinary succession and vocation hast thou?* . . . . Touching the church of Rome, I will say no more for this present, but only that was spoken openly by Cornelius, the bishop of Bitonto, in the late Council of Trent, *Would God they were not all gone, by consent together, from Religion to Superstition, from Faith to Infidelity, from Christ to Antichrist!* These few words, considering either the speaker or the place where they were spoken, may seem sufficient. They are gone from Faith to Infidelity—from Christ to Antichrist—and yet, all other things failing, they must hold only by succession, and, only because they sit in Moses' chair, they must claim the possession of the whole: this is the right and virtue of their succession.' And then speaking of Bishops, Jewell remarks, 'Neither doth the Church of England this day depend of them . . . . as if our church were no church without them . . . . notwithstanding, if there were not one, neither of them nor of us, left alive, yet would not therefore the whole church of England flee to *Lovaine*.\* Tertullian saith:—*And we, being laymen are we not priests? It is written, Christ hath made us both a kingdom and priests unto God his Father.* . . . . *Yea, and be there but three together, and though they be laymen, yet is there a church.*' And this reformer then adds, 'To be short, we succeed the bishops that have been before our days. . . . . If they were deceived in anything, we succeed them in place, but *not in error*; they were our predecessors, but not the rules and standards of our faith: or rather, to set apart all comparison of persons, the doctrine of Christ this day, Mr. Harding, succeedeth your doctrine, as the *Day* succeedeth the *Night*, as the *Light* succeedeth *Darkness*, and as the *Truth* succeedeth *Error*. . . . It is not sufficient to claim succession of PLACE, it *behoveth us rather to have regard to the succession of DOCTRINE*. St. Bernard saith, 'What availeth it if they be chosen in order, and live out of order? . . . . Compare the use and order of our churches, Mr. Harding, with the primitive church of God, and ye shall easily see the right of our succession. St. Cyprian saith, *If the pipes of the conduit, which before ran with abundance, happen to fail, do we not use to search to the head, &c.? The priests of God, keeping God's commandments, must do the same: that if the truth have fainted or failed in any point, we return to the VERY ORIGINAL OF OUR LORD, AND TO THE TRADITION OF THE GOSPEL AND OF THE APOSTLES, that thence we may take the discretion of our doings from whence the Order itself and Original first began.*' (pp. 119—122, 129, 132, 139, 140.)

3.—On *The Power of the Keys*, (Matt. xvi. 19; xviii. 18,) Jewell observes:—'Gentle reader! For the better understanding hereof, it may please thee to consider that the word of God, according to the sundry effects and properties thereof, hath sundry names. For

\* A city in the Netherlands, at that time celebrated for its popish university.

‘example—for that it increaseth and multiplieth, it is called *seed* ; —for that it cutteth the heart and divideth the flesh from the spirit, it is called a *sword* ;—for that it taketh and incloseth us and bringeth us together, it is called a *net* ;—for that it washeth us clean, it is called *water* ;—for that it inflameth us, it is called *fire* ;—for that it feedeth us, it is called *bread* ;—and even so, for that it openeth and giveth us an entry into the house, it is called *the key*. This *house* is the kingdom of heaven—*Christ* is the door—THE WORD OF GOD IS THE KEY.\* Jewell affirms, ‘That Christ hath given to his ministers power to *bind*, to *loose*, to *open*, to *shut*.’ The act of OPENING and LOOSING he thus explains :—‘We say that the office of *loosing* consisteth in this point—that the minister, either by the preaching of the gospel, offereth the merits of Christ and full pardon to such as have lowly and contrite hearts and do unfeignedly repent themselves, pronouncing unto the same a sure and undoubted forgiveness of their sins and hope of everlasting salvation ; or else, that the same minister, when any have offended their brother’s mind with some great offence or notable and open crime, whereby they have, as it were, banished and made themselves strangers from the common fellowship and from the body of Christ, then, after perfect amendment of such persons, doth reconcile them and bring them home again, and restore them to the company and unity of the faithful.’ And the act of BINDING and SHUTTING, Jewell explains thus :—‘We say also that the minister doth execute the authority of *binding and shutting*, as often as he shutteth up the gate of the kingdom of heaven against unbelieving and stubborn persons, denouncing unto them God’s vengeance and everlasting punishment ; or else, when he doth quite shut them out from the bosom of the church by open excommunication.’ And this reformer then adds,—‘Out of doubt, what sentence soever the minister of God shall give in this sort, God himself doth so well allow it, that whatsoever here in earth, by their means, is *loosed and bound*, God himself will loose and bind and confirm the same in heaven.’ (pp. 141, 143, 148, 150.)

4.—And on the *Supremacy of Civil Governors*,† Jewell writes as follows :—‘Howbeit that the prince is the highest judge and

---

\* The explanation of “THE KEYS” given by the reformer Tyndal is similar to that here given by Jewell. Tyndal observes : ‘Peter in the second of the Acts practised his keys, and, by preaching the law, brought the people into the knowledge of themselves, and BOUND their consciences, so that they were pricked in their hearts, and said unto Peter and to the other apostles, *What shall we do?* Then brought they forth the KEY of the sweet promises, saying, *Repent and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins.* . . . Of like ensamples is the Acts full, and Peter’s Epistles and Paul’s Epistles and all the Scripture. Neither hath our holy father (the pope) any other authority of Christ, or by the reason of his predecessor Peter, than to *preach God’s Word.* . . . So beware of their counterfeited keys, . . . their traditions and ceremonies, their hypocrisy and false doctrine, wherewith they catch, not souls unto Christ, but authority and riches unto themselves.’—(*The Obedience of a Christian Man*, 1528, fol. 45, 46.)

† Tyndal strongly asserted the supremacy of civil governors, and the Christian duty of passive obedience to “the powers that be,” thus :—‘As the



governor over all his subjects whatsoever, as well priests as laymen, without exception, is most evident, . . . by the whole course of the Scriptures, and by the undoubted practice of the primitive

law is a terrible thing, even so is the king: for he is ordained to take vengeance, and hath a sword in his hand, and not peacock's feathers. Fear him therefore, and look on him as thou wouldest look on a sharp sword that hanged over thy head by an hair.—Heads and governors are ordained of God, and are even the gift of God, whether they be good or bad; and whatsoever is done unto us by them, that doth God, be it good or bad. If they be evil, why are they evil?—Verily, for our wickedness' sake are they evil. . . . Evil rulers then are a sign that God is angry and wrath with us. Is it not a great wrath and vengeance . . . that lords and kings should be tyrants unto their subjects, which pay them tribute, . . . labouring and toiling to find them in honour, and to maintain them in their estate? Is not this a fearful judgment of God, and a cruel wrath, that the very prelates and shepherds of our soul, which were wont to feed Christ's flock with Christ's doctrine, and to walk before them in living thereafter, and to give their lives for them, to their ensample and edifying, and to strengthen their weak faiths, are now so sore changed, that if they smell that one of *their* flock (as they now call them, and no longer Christ's) do but once long or desire for the true knowledge of Christ, they will slay him, burn him with fire, most cruelly? What is the cause of this, and that they also teach false doctrine, confirming it with lies? Verily, it is the hand of God to avenge the wickedness of them that have no love nor lust unto the truth of God when it is preached, but rejoice in unrighteousness. (2 Thess., Ex. vii. xiii.) . . . Let us receive all things of God, whether it be good or bad,—let us humble ourselves under his mighty hand, and submit ourselves unto his nurture and chastising, and not withdraw ourselves from his correction.—Read Heb. xii. for thy comfort; and let us not take the staff by the end, or seek to avenge ourselves on his rod, which is the evil rulers. The child, as long as he seeketh to avenge himself upon the rod, hath an evil heart, for he thinketh not that the correction is right, or that he hath deserved it; neither repenteth, but rejoiceth in his wickedness: and so long shall he never be without a rod; yea, so long shall the rod be made sharper and sharper. If he acknowledge his fault, and take the correction meekly, and even kiss the rod, and amend himself with the learning and nurture of his father and mother, then is the rod taken away and burnt:—so if we resist evil rulers, seeking to set ourselves at liberty, we shall, no doubt, bring ourselves into more cruel bondage, and wrap ourselves in much more misery and wretchedness. For if *the heads overcome*, then lay they more weight on their backs; and make their yoke sorer, and tie them shorter.—If *they overcome* their evil rulers, then make they way for a more cruel nation, or for some tyrant of their own nation, which hath no right unto the crown.—If we *submit ourselves* unto the chastising of God, and meekly acknowledge our sins for which we are scourged, and kiss the rod and amend our living, then will God take the rod away, that is, he will give the rulers a better heart: or if they continue their malice and persecute you for well-doing, and because ye put your trust in God, then will God deliver you out of their tyranny for his truth's sake.—It is the same God now that was in the old time, and delivered the fathers and the prophets, the apostles and other holy saints, and whatsoever he sware to them he hath sworn to us. . . . Whosoever the children of Israel fell from the way which God commanded them to walk in, he gave them up under one tyrant or another. As soon as they came to the knowledge of themselves, and repented crying for mercy, and leaning unto the truth of his promises, he sent one to deliver them, as the histories of the Bible make mention. A Christian man, in respect of God, is but a passive thing—a thing that suffereth only and doth nought, as the sick, in respect of the surgeon or physician, doth but suffer only. The surgeon lanceth and cutteth out the dead flesh, searcheth the wounds, thrusteth in tenters, searcheth, burneth, seweth or stitcheth,

' church. . . . We say the prince is put in trust, as well  
 ' with the first as with the second table of the law of God, that is to  
 ' say, as well with *religion* as with *temporal government*, not only to  
 ' keep and perform the contents of *both* tables in his own person (for  
 ' so much every private man is bound to do) but also to *see that all*  
 ' *others his subjects*, as well priests as laymen, each man in his calling  
 ' do duly keep them. This is it that no private man is able to do:  
 ' therefore St. Augustine saith, *herein kings serve the Lord, in that*  
 ' *they be kings when they do those things to serve him that no man can*  
 ' *do but only kings*. We say not, the prince is bound to do the  
 ' bishop's duty, . . . but thus we say, the prince is bound to  
 ' *see the bishops to do their duties.*'

To prove the supremacy of the civil governors, and to show the obligation and duty resting on them to provide for the service and honour of God in the state committed to their charge, Jewell traces through the Scriptures the special regard which civil magistrates have ever shown in ecclesiastical matters. First, he notices, 'That God, by his prophets, often and earnestly commandeth the king to cut down the groves, to break down the images and altars of idols, and to write out the book of the law for himself; and besides that, the prophet Esaias saith, *a king ought to be a patron and a nurse of the church, &c.*' Then Jewell observes: 'We see by histories and by examples of the best times, that good princes ever took the administration of ecclesiastical matters to pertain to their duty,' remarking that, 'MOSES, being *a civil magistrate* and chief guide of the people, both received from God and delivered to the people all the order for religion and sacrifices, and gave Aaron, the bishop, a vehement and sore rebuke for making the golden calf and for suffering the corruption of religion, (Ex. xxxii.)—JOSHUA, also, though he were none other than a civil magistrate, yet, as soon as he was chosen by God and set as a ruler over the people, he received commandments specially touching religion and the service of God, (Joshua i.)—King DAVID, when the whole religion of God was altogether brought out of frame by wicked King Saul, brought home again the ark of God, that is to say, he restored religion again, and was not only amongst them himself as a counsellor and furtherer of the work,

---

' and layeth to caustics to draw out the corruption, and last of all, layeth to healing-plasters and maketh whole. The physician likewise giveth purgations and drinks to drive out the disease, and then with restoratives bringeth health. Now if the sick resist the razor, the searching-iron, and so forth, doth he not resist his own health, and is cause of his own death?—So likewise is it of us, if we resist evil rulers, which are the *rod and scourge* wherewith God chastiseth us—the *instruments* wherewith God searcheth our wounds—and bitter *drinks* to drive out the sin and to make it appear—and *caustics* to draw out, by the roots, the core of the disease of the soul that fretteth inward. A Christian man therefore receiveth all things of the hand of God—both good and bad—both sweet and sour—both wealth and woe!'

—(Tyndal's *Obedience of a Christian Man*, 1528, fol. 37—40.)

If Tyndal thus inculcated the duty of passive submission and penitential humiliation on Christian subjects, in times of papal darkness, when the British Constitution both in Church and State persecuted the true church of Christ—in what terms would he address the true church in these days?

‘but he appointed also hymns and psalms, put in order the companies, and was the only doer in setting forth that whole solemn triumph, and, in effect, *ruled the priests*, (1 Chron. xiii. xv. xvi. xxiv.; 2 Chron. viii. 14.)—King SOLOMON built unto the Lord the temple which his father David had but purposed in his mind to do, and, after the finishing thereof, he made a godly oration to the people concerning religion and the service of God: he afterward displaced Abiathar the priest, and set Zadok in his place, (2 Chron. v. vi. vii. viii.; 1 Kings, ii. 26, 35; viii.)—After this, when the temple of God was in shameful wise polluted, through the naughtiness and negligence of the priests, King HEZECHIAH commanded the same to be cleansed from the rubbish and filth, the priests to light up candles to burn incense, and to do their divine service according to the old and allowed order. The same king also commanded the brazen serpent, which then the people wickedly worshipped, to be taken down and beaten to powder, (2 Chron. xxix.; 2 Kings, xviii. 3, 4.)—King JEHOSHAPHAT overthrew and utterly made away the hill-altars and groves whereby he saw God’s honour hindered and the people holden back with private superstition from the ordinary temple which was at Jerusalem; whereto they should, by order, have resorted yearly from every part of the realm, (2 Chron. xvii.)—King JOSIAH, with great diligence, put the priests and bishops in mind of their duties, (2 Chron. xxxv.)—King JOASH bridled the riot and arrogance of the priests, (2 Kings, xii.)—JEHU put to death the wicked prophets, (2 Kings, x.)’

After this Jewell writes thus: ‘To rehearse no more examples out of the old law, let us rather consider since the birth of Christ how the church hath been governed in the time of the gospel.—The Christian emperors, in the old time, appointed the councils of the bishops—CONSTANTINE called the Council at Nice—THEODOSIUS *the First* called the Council at Constantinople—THEODOSIUS *the Second* called the Council at Ephesus—MARCIAN called the Council at Chalcedon.\* . . . Continually, for the space of 500 years, the emperor alone appointed the ecclesiastical assemblies, and called the councils of the bishops together.’ Jewell then remarks: ‘That the emperor *Constantine* sat not only together with them in the Council of Nice, but gave also advice to the bishops how it was best to try out the matter by the apostles and prophets’ writings.’—That ‘the emperor *Theodosius* did not only sit amongst the bishops, but also ordered the whole arguing of the cause, and tore in pieces the heretics’ books.’—That ‘in the Council of Chalcedon a civil magistrate condemned for heretics, by the sentence of his own mouth, the Bishops Dioscorus, Juvenal, and Thelassius, and gave judgment to put them down from their dignities in the church.’—That ‘in the Third Council at Constantinople, *Constantine*, a civil magistrate, did not only sit among the bishops, but did also subscribe with them, *for* (saith he) *we both read and subscribed* ;’—and that ‘in the Second Council, called Arausicanum,

---

\* The councils here referred to were held in the following years, viz.—Nice in 325; Constantinople in 381; Ephesus in 431; and Chalcedon in 451.



‘the princes’ ambassadors, being noblemen born, not only spake  
 ‘their mind touching religion, but set to their hands also, as well  
 ‘as the bishops.’ From these considerations Jewell deduces the  
 following inferences:—‘Let us see then: such men as have au-  
 ‘thority over the bishops—such men as receive from God com-  
 ‘mandments concerning religion—such as bring home again the  
 ‘ark of God—make holy hymns—oversee the priests—build the  
 ‘temple—make orations touching divine service—cleanse the tem-  
 ‘ple—destroy the hill-altars—burn the idols’ groves—teach the  
 ‘priests their duties—write them out precepts how they should live  
 ‘—kill the wicked prophets—displace the high priests—summon  
 ‘together the holy councils—sit together with the bishops, in-  
 ‘structing them what they ought to do—examine, condemn, and  
 ‘punish heretical bishops—be made acquainted with matters of  
 ‘religion—which subscribe and give sentence to the determinations  
 ‘of councils—and do all these things not by any other man’s  
 ‘commission, but in their own name, and that both uprightly and  
 ‘godly—shall we say, *it pertaineth not to such men to have to do*  
 ‘*with religion?*—Or shall we say, *a Christian magistrate which dealeth*  
 ‘*amongst others in these matters, doeth either naughtily, or presumptu-*  
 ‘*ously, or wickedly?* The most ancient and Christian emperors and  
 ‘kings that ever were, did occupy themselves in these matters; and  
 ‘yet were they never, for this cause, noted either of wickedness or  
 ‘of presumption. And what is he that can find out either princes  
 ‘more catholic, or examples more notable?’ (pp. 569, 571, 572, 574,  
 577—582, 592, 597, 600, 601, 603, 610, 611.)

See Jewell’s “*Defence of his Apology*,” folio edit. 1609.

---

## Eminent Divines since the Reformation.

---

WHITGIFT,

Archbishop of Canterbury, 1583—died, 1604,

Published in 1574, “*The Defence of the Answer to the Admonition against the Reply of T: C:*” (Thomas Cartwright.)—The Admonition had been addressed to the Parliament, and its object was to subvert Episcopacy and establish Presbyterianism in the English Church.\*

---

\* The Protestant Reformed English Church was established in 1562.—Its Constitution was immediately assailed by the *Papist* Harding, and Jewell’s *Defence of his Apology*, published in or about the year 1565, remains a standard work against the assaults of Popery at the present day.—After this, the English Ecclesiastical Constitution was attacked by the *Puritan* Cartwright; and Whitgift’s *Defence of his Answer*, published in 1574, remains a standard

1.—In the *Preface to this work*, dedicated “*To the Godlie Reader,*” are the following remarks: ‘It were but a needless labour to make any particular recital of those points of Doctrine which this Church of England at this day doth hold and maintain, for they be, at large, set down in sundry English books, and especially in *The Apology of the Church of England* and the *Defence* of the same; summarily also collected together in the Book of Articles, agreed upon in the Convocation at London, anno 1562, &c. This I dare boldly affirm, that all points of Religion, *necessary to salvation and touching either the mystery of our redemption in Christ, or the right use of the Sacraments and true manner of Worshipping God,* are as purely and perfectly taught, and by public authority established in this Church of England, at this day, as ever they were in any church since the Apostles’ time, or now be in any Reformed Church in the world;—the which, to be true, those that be learned (even among the mislikers of this present state) cannot nor will not deny.—Likewise that all Heresies, all Corrupt Doctrines, all Superstitious and Papistical Opinions have been and be, by the Prince and the realm, banished—by the learned Bishops and Preachers, in word and in writing confuted—who is so blinded with malice that he cannot see, or so froward and wilful that *he will not confess?*—What shall we then think of those men, that are so far from acknowledging this singular and unspeakable benefit, proceeding from the mere mercy of God; so far from being thankful for the same—from desiring the continuance of it with hearty prayers—that, by all means possible, they seek rather to obscure it, and to deface it, because, in *certain Accidental Points*, they have not their fantasies and proper devices? If this be not to set themselves against God, and to trouble the peace of the church for *external* things (which is schismatical) let the quiet and godly Christian judge.—How much better had it been for them to have proceeded in *teaching necessary points of doctrine, and exhorting to Obedience, to Concord, to Godly Life and Conversation* than thus, with no small rejoicing of the wicked, great offence of the weak gospellers, marvellous grief of the Queen’s Majesty, and other that have the care of government, frowardly to disquiet and disturb the church, trouble the happy peace of the commonwealth, and hazard the whole state of religion, they shall one day (if not too late) well understand. . . . The

---

work against the Assaults of Dissent in the times in which we live.—It should be remembered, that Jewell’s work appeared within *three or four years after the settling of the Thirty-nine Articles*, and Whitgift’s work was published within *twelve years* after that event. These men, therefore, must have been *thoroughly acquainted* with the principles on which the National Church was founded. They were both universally acknowledged as its best and most able champions, and received marks of favour and distinction from Queen Elizabeth.—The candid inquirer after truth, therefore, in matters pertaining to the Polity of the Reformed English Church, will feel much satisfaction in the perusal of both these works: and it is earnestly to be desired that the Parker Society will not suffer its labours to close without adding to the writings of the English Reformers these two important works of *Jewell* and *Whitgift*, which ought, especially in these perilous days, to be in the hands of every clergyman, as the ablest defence of our Ecclesiastical Establishment.

‘state of this Church of England at this day (God be thanked) is not  
‘Heathenish, Turkish, or Papistical, in which condition many things  
‘might be done, that otherwise are not to be attempted: but it is  
‘the state of a Church Reformed, and, by authority and consent, set-  
‘tled, not only in truth of doctrine, . . . but also in order of things  
‘external touching the government of the church, and administration  
‘of the sacraments. Wherefore the controversy is not, Whether  
‘many of the things mentioned by the *Platformers*\* were fitly used in  
‘the apostles’ time, or may now be well used in some places, yea, or  
‘*be conveniently used in sundry Reformed Churches at this day*: for  
‘none of these branches are denied; *neither do we take upon us (as*  
‘*we are slandered) either to blame or to condemn other Churches for*  
‘*such orders as they have received, most fit for their estates*:—but this  
‘is the whole state of our controversy (when *WE of this church*, in  
‘these perilous days, do see that we have a great number of hollow  
‘hearts within this realm that daily gape for alteration of religion,  
‘and many mighty and great enemies abroad busily devising and  
‘working to bring the same to pass, and to overthrow the state, both  
‘of religion and of the realm), Whether (*seeing we have a settled Order*  
‘*in Doctrine and Government, received and confirmed by Law*, it may  
‘stand with godly and Christian wisdom) with disobedience to the  
‘prince and law, and with the unquietness of the church and offence  
‘of many consciences, to attempt so great alteration as this platform  
‘must needs bring,—and *that, for matters external only*, and with such  
‘eagerness and bitterness, that they deface and discredit the whole  
‘state of this church, with all the preachers and ecclesiastical gover-  
‘nors of the same, as remaining in horrible corruptions and anti-  
‘christian deformities;—and thereby fill the mouths of the adversaries  
‘with greater matter of obloquy to deface the gospel, than ever of  
‘themselves they had been able to devise. . . . *I know that*  
‘*no Church can be so perfect, in all points of external Government and*  
‘*Ceremonies, but that such as be disposed may pick some occasion of*  
‘*quarrelling thereat, though unjustly*: therefore the true members of  
‘the church must not be too light of credit, nor too ready to follow  
‘Contentious Captains: for, St. Paul saith, *If any be contentious*  
‘*among you, WE have no such custom, neither THE CHURCHES OF*  
‘*GOD, &c. (1 Cor. xi. 16.)* . . . . This reply of T. C. con-  
‘sisteth of two false principles and rotten pillars; whereof the *one*  
‘is, that we must, of necessity, have the same kind of government  
‘that was in the apostles’ time and is expressed in the Scriptures,  
‘and no other: the *other* is, that we may not in any wise or  
‘in any consideration, retain in the church anything that hath  
‘been abused under the pope. If these two posts be weak, yea  
‘rotten, (as I have proved them to be in this my Defence,)  
‘then must the building of necessity fall.—Touching the first,  
‘it is to be understood that there is a double government of the  
‘church, the one *spiritual*, the other *external*.—*Christ only, and*  
‘*none other, by the operation of His Spirit and direction of His*

---

\* Cartwright called the form of Church Government proposed by him, “A true Platform of a Church Reformed.”



Word, spiritually governeth his church, and (reigning in the consciences of the faithful) guideth their minds in all matters of devotion, faith, and holiness; and this is the *Spiritual Kingdom of Christ*, so much spoken of in the Scriptures, and especially in the Prophets.—Of this kind of government I mean not.—The *External Government* hath both a substance and a matter, about which it is occupied, and also a form to attain the same, consisting in certain offices and functions, and in the names and titles of them.—The substance and matter of government must indeed be taken out of the Word of God, and consisteth in these points, that the *Word* be truly taught, the *Sacraments* rightly administered, *Virtue* furthered, *Vice* repressed, and the *Church* kept in quietness and order. *The offices in the Church, whereby this government is wrought, be not, namely and particularly, expressed in the Scriptures, but, in some points, left to the discretion and liberty of the Church, to be disposed according to the state of Times, Places, and Persons.*

2.—Immediately after the preface, Whitgift quotes the ‘dangerous points of doctrine avouched by T. C. in his reply.’ One is, “that the government of the church is aristocratical or popular, and therefore that no government of any commonwealth ought to be monarchical, but either aristocratical or popular.” Whitgift replies, ‘Which is a dangerous error, and springeth of this, that he (T. C.) doth not distinguish betwixt the *Essential* Points of the government of the church, and the *Accidental* Points of the same: for the *Essential* Points of ecclesiastical government may well agree with any lawful state of commonwealth and civil kind of government, as the *Gospel* may be truly preached in them all, the *Sacraments* rightly ministered, *Discipline* duly executed, and such like: but, the *ACCIDENTAL POINTS* of government (as the manner of Electing ministers, the kind of *Discipline*, *Accidental Ceremonies*, and other such like *Rites* and *Circumstances*) may be varied according to *Time*, *Place*, and *Persons*; and are so to be framed, as they may best agree with the state and government of EVERY COMMONWEALTH.’

3.—In the *Answer to Cartwright’s Epistle Dedicatory*, Whitgift remarks: ‘It is true that there is great resistance so soon as the Lord openeth any door to his gospel, and that by sundry means and divers kinds of men, as the stories of the church from time to time declare, and daily experience teacheth:—it is also true that many, under this pretence of right government and restoring of discipline, have and do disturb the churches wherein the gospel is sincerely preached, and the sacraments rightly ministered. . . . Therefore this pretence of restoring the right government of the church, with so great disquietness of the same, is but a cover to hide the further purposes of Satan, the enemy of the peace and quietness of the church. . . . It will fall out, I think, that your opinions now in question, tend indeed to confusion—respect neither time, place, nor persons—confound degrees—bring such in contempt as be in authority—make the ignorant subject lofty and arrogant—take from princes their due authority in ecclesiastical matters; when, as present experience and the peace and quietness of this church, since the beginning of the Queen’s Majesty’s reign

‘ (until you and your company began to broach these your fantasies)  
 ‘ declareth, That the doctrine maintained by those, whom you count  
 ‘ as your adversaries, is most agreeable to order, preserveth peace,  
 ‘ keepeth every man in his degree and calling. And truly, if the  
 ‘ government of the church, now allowed by public authority, be  
 ‘ compared with your new-devised policy, the difference of them  
 ‘ both will easily appear. For, I pray you, tell me, *How many of*  
 ‘ *you, which have been permitted as preachers in several places, have*  
 ‘ *consented in one kind of government:—nay, which of you have not*  
 ‘ *troubled, not only the town where you have remained, but the whole*  
 ‘ *country round about also?* . . . . Wheresoever you come you  
 ‘ make contention and kindle the fire of discord. Experience doth  
 ‘ teach it to be so. . . . *I perceive no such distinction of the*  
 ‘ *commonwealth and the church, that they should be counted, as it*  
 ‘ *were, two several bodies, governed with divers laws and divers ma-*  
 ‘ *gistrates, except the church be linked with an heathenish and idola-*  
 ‘ *trous commonwealth.* The civil magistrate may not take upon  
 ‘ him such ecclesiastical functions as are only proper to the minister  
 ‘ of the church; as preaching of the word, administering of the  
 ‘ sacraments, excommunicating, and such like: but that he hath no  
 ‘ authority in the church to make and execute laws for the church;  
 ‘ and in things pertaining to the church, as Discipline, Ceremonies,  
 ‘ &c. (so that he do nothing against the Word of God) though the  
 ‘ Papists affirm it never so stoutly: yet is the contrary most true and  
 ‘ sufficiently proved by men of notable learning, as Master Jewell,  
 ‘ Bishop of Salisbury, Master Horne, Bishop of Winchester, Master  
 ‘ Nowell, Dean of Paul’s, in their books written against papists  
 ‘ holding your assertion, to whose painful and learned writings I  
 ‘ refer the reader. . . . Do you not think the punishment for  
 ‘ stealing and murder to be sharp enough? . . . Are you per-  
 ‘ suaded, that the civil magistrate either may not or will not correct  
 ‘ lying, uncomely jesting, hard and cholerick speeches? Or that, if  
 ‘ these were punished by the discipline of the church, men would  
 ‘ rather be terrified from the greater crimes, than they will be if they  
 ‘ be punished with civil correction? Truly, I think that the civil  
 ‘ magistrate hath sufficient authority to provide remedies for all such  
 ‘ mischiefs, without altering the state, either of the church or of the  
 ‘ commonwealth:—but let the indifferent reader judge, whether you  
 ‘ go about to wring the sword out of the magistrates’ hand or no;  
 ‘ or at the least, so to order the matter, that it be never drawn out  
 ‘ to punish vice, but with the consent and at the appointment of you  
 ‘ and your seigniory. . . . I do not say, that the church is  
 ‘ without fault, for *then should I affirm an impossibility*; but I think  
 ‘ the faults that are, rather to be in the *Persons* than in the *Laws*—  
 ‘ rather in the *Governors* than in the *Kind of Government*: neither  
 ‘ would I have men (either Puritans, Donatists,\* or Anabaptists) to  
 ‘ dream of such a Church as *Plato* did of a *Commonwealth*—*Aristotle*  
 ‘ of *Felicity*—and the *Stoics* of their *Just Man*: much less to make  
 ‘ contention in the church, or divide themselves from the same, if all

\* The Donatists were a sect of the fourth century.

*things go not according to their Fantasy ; for then shall they never be quiet with any church ; no, not long with that church which they themselves do presently best like of. Surely, if this rule be certain, that the Commonwealth shall not flourish until the Church be Reformed,* then this may be a good token unto us, that this church of England *is reformed*, because the Commonwealth doth flourish. Neither do I speak this to flatter the magistrates, and to sew cushions under their elbows, . . . but I speak it before God—I speak it as I think : and the rather I utter it to deliver both the state of the church, and also of the commonwealth of England, from the unthankful, unnatural, and slanderous tongues of such as seek to deface and deprave them both:—I will not defend the vice, the negligence, the security of any man. I shall be as bold and as ready to tell even the best thereof, in time and place (as occasion is ministered and my duty shall require) as any of those shall be, which would seem to be furthest from all kind of flattery. . . . If any nation shall refuse the Word of God offered unto it, or not suffer Christ wholly to be placed in his throne, no doubt, God will pour upon that nation his plagues, as he hath done upon all other that have run into the same contempt : but would you make your reader believe, *That, because this church of England doth not admit your kind of government, therefore the Walls of it be broken, the Word of God contemned, and Christ not suffered wholly to be placed in his throne?* We admit the gospel wholly, and, in government, the magistrates take upon them no office only proper to Christ, neither yet any authority, which is not, by the Word of God, limited unto them. These words might aptly have been spoken, if you had written against the state of the church in France, or any such like kingdom as refuseth the gospel offered unto it, and most cruelly persecuteth the true professors of the same.—I do not excuse such in the church of England, as contemn the Word of God ; neither do I justify the whole church, for not receiving the gospel offered, by bringing forth the fruits thereof, as it ought to do:—but I exhort every man, from the highest to the lowest, even in the bowels of Jesus Christ to have a better regard thereunto, lest it be said unto us, as it is said unto the church of Ephesus, (Rev. ii. 4. 5.) *I have something against thee, because thou hast forsaken thy former love, &c.* And to the Hebrews, (Heb. vi. 7. 8.) *for the earth which drinketh in rain that cometh oft upon it, and bringeth forth herbs meet for them, by whom it is dressed receiveth blessing of God : but that which beareth thorns and briars, is reprov'd and is near unto cursing, whose end is to be burned.* For surely, even these contentions, stirred up in the church, where the gospel is truly preached, are arguments that *we be void of love and peace, the chief and principal tokens and fruits of the gospel.* . . . Why is not Her Majesty the head of this church also as well as of this commonwealth ? For I must give thee to understand, good reader, that T. C. maketh the church and the commonwealth two such distinct and several bodies, as must, of necessity, have distinct and several magistrates and governors ; and that the civil magistrate hath not to meddle in ecclesiastical matters, except



'his aid be required by the pastor and seigniory, or such like cases,  
 'wherein he flatly joineth with the *papists*, who say, that the civil  
 'magistrate hath only *potestatem facti*, and not *juris*, that is, autho-  
 'rity to *execute* such things as they decree, but not authority to *make*  
 'any laws in ecclesiastical matters. . . . I know not how he (T. C.)  
 'could have made a greater difference betwixt the church and the  
 'commonwealth, in those places, *where the princes be enemies unto the*  
 '*church*:—indeed, true it is, that in the apostles' time, princes did  
 'not meddle in causes ecclesiastical, except it were by persecuting  
 'it, &c.—For they were *then Infidels, not Christians—Persecutors,*  
 '*not Professors*: and therefore, if all ought, of necessity, to be  
 'reduced to the form of government used in the apostles' time,  
 'Christian princes must be delivered from that care, and be content  
 'to forego that portion of their authority. . . . No  
 'man denieth but God, of his wisdom, in the beginning of the  
 'church of Christ, poured out his gifts more plenteously upon the  
 'simpler, contemptible and weaker sort, and that he chose, for his  
 'apostles, fishermen, toll-gatherers, and ignorant persons, lest that  
 'should be ascribed to the wit, eloquence, and learning of man,  
 'which cometh only of the goodness, might and power of God,  
 'as the apostle plainly declareth, (1 Cor. i. and ii.)—but will you  
 'therefore conclude, that truth, zeal, and godliness remaineth, either  
 'only or especially, in the simple, rude, and ignorant sort? and  
 'make this your conclusion—*The learned, the honourable, men of great*  
 '*countenance or knowledge be of this or that opinion, ERGO, it is not true?*  
 'Or, *The simple, rude and ignorant people are thus and thus persuaded,*  
 '*ERGO, they must be followed?* or to the like effect. Verily this were  
 'to reason as the Franciscan friars do to excuse their ignorance,  
 '*Apostoli nesciebant literas, ergo Franciscanis non est opus literis,*  
 'and like some other fantastical persons also, which think that no  
 'learned, rich, or honourable man shall be saved; but only beggars  
 'and such as be ignorant. . . . You know, (as I sup-  
 'pose) that this place (1 Cor. i.) quoted in your margin doth not  
 'gather any such conclusion, . . . for Nicodemus, Joseph,  
 'Lazarus, . . . with divers others, were politic, wise,  
 'wealthy, learned, and honourable men: and the prophet Isaiah  
 'saith, *That Kings and Queens shall be the nursing fathers and*  
 '*mothers, the Defenders and Maintainers of the Church.* . . .  
 'The simple and plain meaning of the place is, that God, in his  
 'electing to eternal life, hath neither respect to nobility, learning,  
 'riches, or any such thing. . . . *Popularity* you cannot  
 'avoid, seeing you seek so great an equality, commit so many things  
 'to the voices of the people, and, in sundry places, so greatly mag-  
 'nify and extol them, than the which three, what can be more  
 'popular? It is *Singularity* to divide yourself from that church,  
 'which doth profess the word of God truly, and is not to be touched  
 'in any point of doctrine necessary to salvation. It is true that a  
 'godly learned writer saith *Charity knits together and reconcileth—*  
 '*Singularity cutteth in pieces and divideth. It is the beginning and*  
 '*root of all Heresy to hate and condemn the communion of the church:*  
 'and a little after,—*There be some contentious persons whom no*

'church can please, always having something to blame in other, but nothing in themselves—which is a manifest sign of Singularity. . . . We must grow in faith and knowledge, and always be growing and going forward; but it doth not therefore follow, that we must daily invent New Opinions, or broach New Doctrines and alter in judgment.—We must grow in strength of faith, we must increase in practice and love of virtue, we must study to increase our knowledge, that we may be the more confirmed in the truth that we have learned out of the word of God.—This is an evil collection, *We must grow in the knowledge of the truth, THEREFORE we must always be altering and changing our religion.*' (See pp. 1—14.)

4.—The *Commendatory Address* then follows under this title:—*"To his lovyng Nurse, the Christian Church of England, Io. Whitgift, a Membre and Minister of the same, wisheth Peace in Christe and continuance of His Glorious Gospel, even to the worlde's ende."*—And, in the opening of his Defence, are these words:—'I intend not to maintain any corruptions of this church. I will seek for the redress thereof as earnestly as you shall, and more orderly, and therefore, I trust, more effectually; but I neither can nor may suffer *that which is lawfully and by due order established*, unlawfully and out of order, by you, to be defaced.—This your pretence of cleansing the church from corruptions, is but the accustomed excuse of the Novatians, Donatists and Anabaptists, as you know well enough: and therefore, before you condemn me to be a defender of the corruptions of this church, you must *first prove them to be Corruptions*: and when you have so done, you must also declare them to be *such corruptions as deserve this Stir and Hurly-burly for them*;—for there were *great corruptions in the church of the Corinthians, and yet the apostle greatly disliked such as stirred up contentions for the same*. So hath there been *always imperfections in the church, especially in external things*, and yet such as therefore did break the peace of it were always counted as contentious and condemned as schismatics.' (See p. 20.)

5.—Among other reasons or arguments urged by Cartwright in his Admonition, one is,—'*That as such and such things were not in the apostles' time, ERGO, they ought not to be now.*' Whitgift replies:—'Which kind of argument is very deceitful, and the mother and well-spring of many both old and new schisms:—of old, as of them that called themselves *Apostolicos*, and of the Aerians\*—of new, as of the Anabaptists—who, considering neither the diversity of times, concerning the external ecclesiastical policy; nor *the true liberty of the Christian religion in external rites and ceremonies*, in matters neither commanded nor forbidden in God's law; nor the authority of Christian magistrates, in the Christian congregation concerning the same, have boldly enterprised to stir up many and heinous errors. For if these reasons should take place . . . then, no Christians may have any place to abide in; they may have no Christian princes—no ministration of sacraments in churches and such like: for the apostles had no place to abide in; they had

---

\* A small sect in the fourth century, founded by Aerius.

'no Christian princes to govern them, no churches to minister sacraments in, &c. Likewise, we must have all things common (Acts ii. 44, and iv. 32)—we must depart with all our possessions, when we be converted to the gospel (Matt. xix. 27)—baptize abroad in the fields (Acts viii. 38)—minister the Communion in private houses only (Acts. ii. 46, xx. 7, 8)—be always under the cross and under tyrants and such like; for the apostles had all things common, departed from their possessions, baptized abroad in fields, ministered the Communion in private houses, were always under persecutors and tyrants, &c.' (pp. 23, 24.)

6.—Another argument urged by Cartwright, of the same kind as the former one, is, '*That because such and such a thing is not commanded in the Scripture to be done, nor there expressed, ERGO, it ought not to be done.*' Whitgift replies: 'This argument taketh away the most part of all due circumstances without the which, either after one manner or other, *the very Institutions of Christ cannot be observed.* For how is it possible to receive the Holy Communion but either sitting, standing, kneeling, walking, or lying, either at one time or other—in the morning or at night, before meat or after meat, clothed or naked, in this place or in that place, &c.?' and yet *none of these circumstances are in Scripture commanded, or, by necessary collection, may thereof be gathered.* The same is to be said of the observation of Times, of Common Prayers; and other convenient and necessary Orders in the Church. If this argument were good, then all good laws and ordinances made for the advancing of true religion and establishing of good orders were to be abolished, which were the very root and well-spring of stubbornness, obstinacy, sedition, disobedience and confusion.' (p. 24.)

7.—Whitgift next proceeds to notice some of *the errors and doctrines which disturbed the peace of the church in his day*, in the following terms: 'Considering the strangeness of the time, the variety of men's minds, and the marvellous inclinations in the common sort of persons (especially where the gospel is most preached) to embrace new-invented doctrines and opinions, though they tend to the disturbing of the quiet state of the church, the discrediting and defacing of such as be in authority, and the maintaining of licentiousness and lewd liberty, I thought it good to set before your eyes the practices of the Anabaptists,\* their conditions and qualities, the kind and manner of their beginnings and proceedings, before the broaching of their manifold and horrible heresies, to the intent that you, understanding the same, may the rather in time take heed to such as proceed in like manner. . . . FIRST, Anabaptism tendeth to this end, that (in those places where the gospel hath been for a time preached, and where churches be reformed) the gospel may be hindered, the churches disquieted, the

---

\* After the preaching of Luther, this sect sprang up in Germany. They professed to carry out the principles of Protestantism to their legitimate extent; but fell into grievous errors, and caused considerable disturbance in that country. Allusion is made to them in our 38th Article; though, it may be noted, the present Anabaptists in England do not retain their more objectionable tenets.



‘simple brought to doubt of the religion that hath been taught  
 ‘them, contentious and unquiet minds may have matter to work on,  
 ‘the preaching of the gospel become odious: finally, that magistrates  
 ‘and such as be in authority may be contemned and despised of their  
 ‘subjects and inferiors. **SECONDLY**, They bitterly inveighed against  
 ‘ministers and preachers of the gospel, saying that they were not  
 ‘ordinarily and lawfully called to the ministry, because they were  
 ‘called by the magistrate and not by the people. **THIRDLY**, The  
 ‘whole Reformation that was then in the church displeased them, as  
 ‘not spiritual enough and perfect; for the sacraments were not (as  
 ‘they said) sincerely ministered; things were not reduced to the  
 ‘Apostolic church; . . . therefore *that the church, then reformed,*  
*was no more the true church of Christ than was the papistical church.*  
 ‘**FOURTHLY**, That they had their private and secret conventicles,  
 ‘and did divide and separate themselves from the church: neither  
 ‘would they communicate with such as were not of their sect,  
 ‘either in prayers, sacraments, or hearing the word. **FIFTHLY**,  
 ‘They counted all them as wicked and reprobate which were not of  
 ‘their sect. **SIXTHLY**, They pretended, in all their doings, the  
 ‘glory of God, the edifying of the church, and the purity of the  
 ‘gospel.’

Whitgift also adds the following observations on these German separatists:—‘They earnestly cried out against pride, gluttony, &c.  
 ‘*They spake much of mortification*, they pretended great gravity,  
 ‘they sighed much, they seldom or never laughed, they were very  
 ‘austere in reprehending, they spake gloriously; to be short, they  
 ‘were great hypocrites, *thereby to win authority to their heresy*  
*among the simple and ignorant people.*—If they were at any time  
 ‘punished for their errors, they greatly complained that nothing was  
 ‘used but violence, *that the truth was oppressed, that innocent and*  
*godly men, which would have all things reformed according to the*  
*word of God, could not be heard nor have liberty to speak.*—That  
 ‘Zuinglius stopped their mouths and defended his cause, not by the  
 ‘word of God, but by the authority of the magistrate.\* They  
 ‘taught that the civil magistrate hath no authority in ecclesiastical  
 ‘matters, and that he ought not to meddle in causes of religion and

---

\* Whitgift often alludes to the complaint of “*Persecution*,” being raised by those who adopt error, and are themselves actively engaged in its dissemination, whenever any means are resorted to, however temperate or scriptural, for its discouragement or suppression. Such a cry is well suited to awaken popular compassion—not unfrequently the object sought. On one occasion of this kind, in his answer to Cartwright, Whitgift thus expresses himself:—‘Surely, in this point, I must compare you to certain heretics that were in Augustine’s time, who, most bitterly, by sundry means afflicting and molesting the true ministers of the church, yet, for all that, cried out that they were extremely dealt with, and cruelly persecuted by them: or else unto a shrewd and ungracious wife which, beating her husband, by her clamorous complaints, maketh her neighbours believe that her husband beateth her: or to him that is mentioned in Erasmus’ Colloquies that did steal and run away with the priest’s purse, and yet cried always, as he ran, Stay the thief, Stay the thief—and, *thus crying, escaped, and yet he was the Thief himself.*’ (p. 706.)

‘faith. . . . They complained much of persecution, they bragged that they would defend their cause not only with words but with the shedding of their blood also. Their whole intent was to make a separation and a schism, and *to withdraw men from their ordinary churches and pastors*, and therefore most odiously they inveighed against such pastors, and sought, by all means, to discredit them.—There was no stay in them, but daily they invented new opinions, and did run from error to error. They were very stubborn and wilful, which they called constancy; they were wayward and froward; without all humanity, they judged and condemned all other men; they sought to overthrow commonwealths and states of government; they gave honour and reverence to none, and they used to speak to such as were in authority without any signification of honour; neither would they call men by their titles, and they answered churlishly.\* They attributed much unto themselves, and pleased themselves very well: other men they contemned, and therefore their minds were full of pride and contempt. *They went not to preach in such places where the gospel was not planted, but only they insinuated themselves into those places wherein the gospel had been diligently preached; and where there were godly and quiet men, there they made a stir, they raised up factions and bred discord; they sought to be free from all laws and to do what they list; they were animated by crafty and subtle Papists, which did seek the overthrow of the gospel and the restoring of Papism. To be short, the people had them in great admiration, because of their hypocrisy and straightness of life, and such as were of contentious natures joined with them and commended their doings. These were the manners, conditions, practices, and proceedings of the Anabaptists in Germany, before they uttered their seditious and monstrous heresies. . . . .* To conclude, *these men flatly join with the Papists, and by the selfsame assertions bend their force against this Church of England.*’ (See p. 31—51.)

8.—On the *Authority of the Church in things indifferent*, Whitgift states, ‘It is most true that nothing ought to be tolerated in the church as necessary unto salvation, or as an article of faith, *except it be expressly contained in the Word of God, or may manifestly thereof be gathered*; and therefore we utterly condemn and reject

---

\* Whitgift, speaking of Ecclesiastical Offices and Titles, observes: ‘The church must as well be preserved and kept in perfection, peace, and unity, as builded and brought thereunto, and that *such Offices and Functions are lawful as tend to that end, and be therefore by lawful authority appointed.* . . . The names of Metropolitan and Archbishop, &c. be not antichristian names (that is, names invented by Antichrist), but *most ancient*: yea, they were in the church long before the gospel was publicly embraced by any prince, or in any kingdom.’—And (after speaking of the name, LORD, as simply signifying superiority and authority; and the title, MOST HONOURABLE, as denoting some special pre-eminence) Whitgift adds: ‘The name of MOST REVEREND is as much as the name of MOST HONOURABLE, and yet was that name also given unto Bishops in Athanasius’ time, . . . for Athanasius himself is called by his priests and deacons, REVERENDISSIMUS EPISCOPUS.—(See pp. 307, 308, 318, 448, 449.)

Transubstantiation, the Sacrifice of the Mass, the authority of the Bishop of Rome, Worshipping of Images, &c. And in this case, an argument, taken *ab auctoritate Scripturæ negativè*, is most strong: as for example, it is not to be found in Scripture that the Bishop of Rome ought to be the head of the church, and therefore it is not necessary to salvation to believe that he ought to be the head of the church, &c.—It is also true *that nothing in Ceremonies, Order, Discipline, or Government in the Church is to be suffered, being AGAINST THE WORD OF GOD*: and therefore we reject all ceremonies wherein there is any opinion to salvation, worshipping of God or merit, as creeping to the cross, holy bread, holy water, holy candle, &c.; . . . but *that no ceremony, order, discipline, or kind of government may be in the church, except the same be expressed in the Word of God, is a great absurdity and breedeth many inconveniences.* . . . The Scripture hath not prescribed any place or time wherein or when the Lord's Supper should be celebrated, neither yet in what manner.—The Scripture hath not appointed what time or where the congregation shall meet for Common Prayer and for the Hearing of the Word of God. . . . The Scripture hath not appointed what day in the week should be most meet for the Sabbath-day—whether Saturday, which is the Jews' Sabbath, or the day now observed, which was appointed by the church.—The Scripture hath not determined what form is to be used in Matrimony, what words, what prayers, what exhortations.—The Scripture speaketh not one word of standing, sitting, or kneeling at the Communion, of Meeting in churches, fields, or houses to hear the Word of God; of Preaching in pulpits, chairs or otherwise; of Baptizing in fonts, in basons, or rivers, openly or privately, at home or in the church, every day in the week, or on the Sabbath-day only.—And yet, no man (as I suppose) is so simple to think that the church hath no authority to take order in these matters. . . . I pray you, what meant St. Paul in 1 Cor. xiv. 40, after he had prescribed certain orders unto them to be observed in the church, thus generally to conclude, *Let all things be done decently and in order?* Doth he not *there give unto them authority to make Orders in the Church*, so that all things be done in order and decently? The best interpreters do understand this as a *general Rule given unto the Church*, to examine her traditions and constitutions by; and therefore, without all doubt, their judgment is, that *the church hath authority, in external things, to make orders and appoint laws, not expressed in the Word of God, so that this rule of the apostle be observed.* . . . Now if either godly councils or ancient fathers were anything at all regarded of these men (as they be not, such is their arrogance) this controversy might soon be decided:—for the most ancient fathers and best learned, as Justin Martyr, Irenæus, Tertullian, Cyprian, and other do expressly declare, that even *from the Apostles' time, the church hath always had authority in such matters, and hath observed divers orders and ceremonies, not once mentioned in the Word of God.*

After citing a long passage from Calvin's *Institutes*, (ch. xiii.



sec. 31, 32,) referring also to 1 Cor. xi. 16, in proof that *it was not the custom of the churches in the Apostles' times to be contentious*, Whitgift adds:—‘Thus far Calvin. In which words we have these things to consider: FIRST, That God hath, in the Scripture, fully and plainly comprehended all those things that be *necessary to salvation*. SECONDLY, That in ceremonies and external discipline, he hath not, in Scripture, particularly determined anything; but left the same to his church, to make or abrogate, to alter or continue, to add or take away, as shall be thought from time to time most convenient for the present state of the church, so that nothing be done against that general rule of St. Paul, (1 Cor. xiv.) *Let all things be done decently and in order*. THIRDLY, That it is the duty of a Christian man, without superstition, *willingly to obey such constitutions*; not to condemn them, not to neglect them, much less stubbornly and arrogantly to break them. FOURTHLY, That the observing of them taketh not liberty from the conscience, because they be not made to be perpetual and inviolable, but to be altered as time, occasion, and necessity requireth. FIFTHLY, That all ought to obey such ordinances, *for charity sake*, though all stand not in need of them. SIXTHLY, That if a man do violate them, by ignorance or forgetfulness, he doth not offend; if by *contempt or stubbornness*, he doth greatly offend.\* SEVENTHLY, That confusion (which is to suffer every man to do what he list) is the seed of contention and brawling. LAST of all, That the true ministers of God be not contentious, neither yet the churches of God. THESE things, among other, I thought good to note out of Mr. Calvin's words, which, if they were diligently considered, such contentions might soon be ended.’

Whitgift next introduces these words of Bucer, to show his judgment in things indifferent in the church, thus:—‘If you will not admit such liberty and use of *vesture* to this pure and holy church, because they have no commandment of the Lord, nor example of it, I do not see how you can grant to any church that

---

\* In answer to some objections raised by Cartwright against the use of things indifferent, such as the surplice, &c. Whitgift remarks: ‘Surely, of themselves, they be but trifles, as all other external ceremonies and indifferent things be:—it is the *circumstances* that maketh them no trifles, but matters of weight. *For things indifferent being commanded thus or so to be used, by the magistrate (not as necessary to salvation and justification, but as convenient and necessary for order and decency) be not now trifles*. And whosoever, without a lawful urgent cause or in a case of necessity, doth break the law made of them, sheweth himself a disordered person, disobedient, a *contemner of lawful authority*, and a wounder of his weak brother's conscience. And if any man shall say, that this is to bring us again in bondage of the law, and to deprive us of our liberty, I answer, No; for it is not a matter of justification, but of order: and to be under a law is no taking away of Christian liberty. *For the Christian liberty is not a licence to do what thou list, but to serve God in newness of mind, and that for love, not for servile fear*.—Of themselves therefore they be but trifles; but being commanded by the magistrate to be used, or not to be used, they are no trifles—no more than it was for women to come into the church bareheaded, or a man to pray having his cap on his head, *after that St. Paul had made an order to the contrary*.’ (1 Cor. xi. 4, 5.)—(See p. 791.)

‘it may celebrate the Lord’s Supper in the *morning*, and in an open church, especially consecrated to the Lord—that the Sacrament may be distributed to *men kneeling* or standing, yea, to *Women* as well as to *Men*.—For we have received of these things neither commandment of the Lord nor any example; yea, rather the Lord gave a contrary example: for in the *evening*, and in a private house, he did make his supper and distributed the sacraments, and that to *Men only*, and *Sitting* at the table.’

After this, Whitgift proceeds, ‘To prove that nothing in this mortal life is more diligently to be sought for and carefully to be looked unto than the restitution of true religion and reformation of God’s church.’—Referring to the conduct of King JOSIAH, (2 Kings xxiii.)—King JEHOSEPHAT, (2 Chron. xvii.)—King HEZEKIAH, (2 Chron. xxix. xxx. xxxi.)—King DAVID, (Psalm cxxxii.)—and to CHRIST himself, (Matt. xxi. 12, 13,) and then, having cited Deut. iv. 2; xii. 32, he observes:—‘God, in the *old law* to his people, prescribed perfect and absolute laws, not only moral and judicial, but *ceremonial also*; neither was there the least thing to be done in the church omitted in the law; and therefore, for them, at that time and during that state, it was not lawful to add anything nor to take anything away—no—not in ceremonies and other civil laws. Now, in the *time of the gospel*, God hath left unto his church, expressed in his word, a perfect rule of faith and manners, and sufficient to salvation; and cursed is he that shall add anything to it or take anything from it, in that behalf, for therein it is perfect and absolute. But, as he hath left the *judicial law* to the discretion of the magistrate, to add thereunto or take therefrom, or alter and change the same, (so that no law be made against the rule of faith and good manners, expressed in the Word of God, &c.); so hath he left authority unto his church to make laws and appoint orders and ceremonies, as shall from time to time be thought most expedient and profitable for the same, so that nothing be done contrary to his word or repugnant to the same. And this authority hath the church used, even from the apostles’ time, as it is manifest both by the Scriptures (Acts vi. 2, 3; xv. 6, 22; 1 Cor. xi. 33, 34,) and other ecclesiastical stories and ancient fathers.’ (See pp. 78, 79, 83, 88, 89, 94, 95, 110, 111, 113, 115, 116, 123.)

9.—On the *Diversity betwixt the Apostles’ Times and ours*, as requiring a divers kind of government and of ordering ministers, Whitgift writes thus: ‘FIRST, Because, in the apostles’ time, the church was under the cross, and therefore very few in comparison was there that embraced the gospel, and commonly they kept together, or, at the least, met oftentimes, so that one of them was thoroughly known to another, and they themselves could best judge who among them was the fittest to teach and instruct, having always divers fit for that function. Now, the church is in prosperity, and therefore the number that professeth great, and dispersed into divers places and in most parishes not one fit for the ministry among them, or known unto them, so that they should call they know not whom. SECONDLY, In the apostles’ time, all or the most that were Christians were virtuous and godly, and such as did sincerely

‘profess the Word, and therefore the election of their pastor might safely be committed to them: *Now* the church is full of hypocrites, ‘dissemblers, drunkards, whoremongers, &c.; so that if any election were committed to them, they would be sure to take one like to themselves. **THIRDLY**, In the apostles’ time, all that professed Christ had knowledge, and were able to judge who were meet to be their pastor: *Now*, the most ignorant, and without judgment in such matters. **FOURTHLY**, In the apostles’ time there was in the church no idolaters, no superstitious persons, no papists: *Now*, the church is full of papists, atheists, and such like. Who seeth not therefore what strange ministers we should have, if the election of them were committed to their several parishes? **FIFTHLY**, In the apostles’ time there was no church established, being then no Christian magistrates, and therefore the state of the church was popular: *Now*, there is Christian magistrates, and a church established and subject to rulers, &c.’

And, after the specific consideration of these propositions, Whitgift adds: ‘Therefore this diversity of the state of the church requireth a divers kind of government, and another kind of Ordaining ministers. For this cause, in *Concilio Laodicensi*, which was anno 334, it was decreed *that the election of ministers should not be permitted to the people*. . . . It is the general consent of all the learned fathers that it pertaineth to the office of a bishop to order and elect ministers of the Word. In this saith Hierome (in Epist. ad Evagrium), *A Bishop doth excel all other ministers, in that the ordering and appointing of ministers doth properly pertain unto him.*’

And in answer to Cartwright’s assertion, ‘*That the Scripture doth teach this order, that there should be no minister thrust upon the church but by the consent thereof,*’—Whitgift observes, ‘The Scripture doth not teach any such order. It hath examples to the contrary. *It prescribeth herein no certain rule to be perpetual.* There is better reason to the contrary, if the diversity of the time and other circumstances be considered. *The Church also hath not at all times, nor in all places, used ONE FORM and manner of Election, NOT IN THE APOSTLES’ TIME;* . . . Wherefore the Church is neither hurt nor oppressed, if the godly magistrate alone do appoint in it bishops, and take such order for admitting other inferior pastors, as shall be thought to him most convenient; neither is God displeased with him for so doing, if they seek his glory therein, the godly peace and quietness of the church, and have respect to the end of the apostles in appointing ministers. But he is greatly displeased with those that make a necessity where none is, and trouble the churches with their own devices, and *make contention for external matters.*’ (pp. 174, 176, 177, 178, 180, 188, 201, 210.)

10.—For the purpose of proving that it is not necessary the people should have interest in the election of ministers, but that the contrary is convenient, Whitgift asserts that *there is no Certain Form of Electing Ministers in the Scriptures*. His words are these:—‘Now that you have uttered all your authorities and reasons to prove that the people ought to have interest in the electing of their ministers, and that I have sufficiently, I trust, answered the same, let it not



'be troublesome unto you if summarily I collect my reasons that move me to think the contrary.'

I. 'And first, I will prove that *there is no certain form of electing prescribed in Scripture, but that the same is left free for the churches to appoint, as shall be thought most convenient for their states and times*:—These be my reasons,—

'(1.) Christ (whose facts and deeds we ought especially to follow) did of *Himself alone*, without the consent of any (Matt. x. 1, 16; Luke x. 1) call and choose his apostles and likewise the seventy disciples, whom he sent to preach.

'(2.) The Apostles, Acts i. 23, 26, altered this manner and form; for they presented two, and the one of them was *chosen by lot*.

'(3.) In the vi. 5, 6 of the Acts, they clean altered this also: for the people presented seven to the apostles, and they were all chosen *without lots*,—the apostles also laid on their hands upon them.

'(4.) In the xiv. 23 of the Acts, this form is likewise changed; for *Paul and Barnabas ordained ministers*, in every city, without either presentment by the people or casting of lots.

'(5.) In the xiii. 1—3 of the Acts, it is manifest, that Paul and Barnabas were sent only *by the prophets and doctors*, without any consent of the people either given or required. Read the beginning of the chapter, it is plain enough of itself.

'(6.) *Paul sent Timothy and Titus, and gave them authority to ordain other*. (1 Tim. v. 22; 2 Tim i.; Titus i. 5.)

'So that it is certain, that there is no prescript manner and form appointed to be observed *for ever*, seeing that the Apostles themselves did not bind or tie themselves to any such rule, which both *Bullinger, Zuinglius, and Beza\** do likewise confess. . . . *Whereupon also I conclude, that, in the Scriptures, there is no certain form prescribed of Electing Ministers, and that the doings of the apostles in that matter are not at all times, of necessity, to be followed: but it is sufficient to respect their end and purpose, that is, that there be meet ministers, and therefore M. Beza saith, no man may here prescribe any certain rule: but if the conscience be good, it is an easy matter to determine what is most expedient for time, place, and other circumstances.*' (Lib. Conf. cap. 5.)

II. 'Secondly, I will show that *there hath been great diversity, from time to time, used in the church, touching elections, and that the people, at all times and in all places, have not been admitted thereunto*. Touching this, I refer you to that which hath been spoken before, out of Eusebius and Zuinglius (of the apostles appointing of James to be Bishop of Jerusalem) of Cypri. lib. 1. Epist. 4. where he plainly confesseth that electing by the people was 'not then general.' And (after referring to the decrees of the most noted councils, &c. for the purpose of showing that Bishops, Priests, and Deacons were appointed without the consent of the people) Whitgift adds: 'Whereby it is evident, that the people have not, at all times, nor in all places, had interest in the elections of ministers.'

---

\* Reformers of the Continental Churches.

III. 'Last of all, I will set down the reasons *why the people have been debarred from such elections, and why they ought still so to be.*

'(1.) First, the *marvellous contentions* that have been in such kind of elections, by the sinister affections of the people being easily moved to division and parts-taking upon every light occasion.—Examples whereof there be infinite, almost in every election, as it may evidently appear to every one that hath but lightly run over any ecclesiastical history.

'(2.) My second reason is, that if such elections should be committed to the people, the civil magistrate (*who hath the chief government of the church, and to whom the especial care of religion doth appertain*) should not be able to procure such reformation, nor such consent and agreement in matters of religion as he is, *when he hath himself the placing of bishops, and such as be the chief of the clergy*; for the people (who are commonly bent to novelties and to factions, and *most ready to receive that doctrine that seemeth to be contrary to the present state, and that inclineth to liberty*) would usually elect such as would feed their humours; so that the prince neither should have quiet government, neither could be able to preserve the peace of the church, nor yet to plant that religion, that he, in conscience, is persuaded to be sincere.

'(3.) My third reason is taken out of your own book, fol. 25, where you say, that the archdeacon\* may not be judge of the aptness and ableness of the pastor, because he is inferior to the pastor, both in calling and gifts; which, if it be true, then surely may not the people have anything to do in the election of the pastor, being, in all respects, much more inferior unto him than the archdeacon is.

'(4.) It would be a cause why *many churches should be longer destitute of their pastors than is convenient*; for if an unmeet man were chosen, and an appeal made to the next pastors, and from them to the next synod-provincial, and then the parishoners that will not yield, excommunicated, and, after excommunication, complained of to the prince and then driven to a new election, and in the same, peradventure, as wayward as they were before—whilst, I say, all this were in doing (*besides the marvellous schisms, contentions, brawlings, and hatred that must of necessity in the mean time be among them*) two or three years might soon be spent: (for all these things cannot be, in due order, well done in less time) all which time the parishes must be destitute of a pastor, and *burn with those mischiefs that I have before recited.*

'(5.) It would make the government of the church *popular*, which is the *worst kind of government* that can be. For it is true what Calvin saith (cap. xx. Instit.) *The fall from a Kingdom into a Tyranny is very ready; and the change from the Government of the best into the Factions of a few is not much harder: but the fall from a Popular State into a Sedition is, of all other, most easy.*

---

\* In the Ordination Services of the English Church, the Archdeacon (or his deputy) is directed to present the candidates to the Bishop.

‘(6.) The people (as I have said before) *through affection and want of judgment are easily brought by ambitious persons to give their consent to unworthy men.* They are soon moved by the request of their friends and of such as they either fear or love, to do anything—as may appear in sundry things committed unto them of great importance—yea, sometime when by oath they are bound to deal without all affection or partiality.

‘(7.) By this means they would think to have their Pastor bound unto them, so that *they would take it disdainfully to be reproved by him, according as his duty would require.*—Again, the pastor, considering their goodwill in preferring of him, would not so freely reprehend them, nor willingly displease them.

‘(8.) To conclude, the people are for the most part rude and ignorant, careless also in such matters, and more meet to be ruled than to rule: for as Chrysostome defineth, *The People is a certain thing, full of tumult and stirs; consisting, and rashly compacted, for the most part of folly; oftentimes tossed with variable and contrary judgment, like to the waves of the sea, &c.*

‘These and a great number more reasons may be alleged, why the People are to be secluded from the election of their Pastors: and yet do I not so utterly seclude them from such Elections, but that if they have anything to object against him that is to be ordained, they might be heard; which order is prescribed in the Book of Making Ministers; and that is as much as can be required. *Although I do not condemn those churches, wherein this is safely committed unto them: for I only speak of the present estate of this church of England.* The reason why I do think the bishops to be the fittest to have both the allowing and ordaining of such as are to be ministers, I have expressed in my Answer to the Admonition, and they are not as yet by better reasons confuted.’ (pp. 211—216.)

11.—On the *Ceremonies used in Ordaining Ministers*, Whitgift writes thus: ‘To use these words, *Receive the Holy Ghost*, in ordering of ministers, which Christ himself used in appointing his apostles, is no more ridiculous and blasphemous than it is to *use the words that he used in the Supper*: but it is blasphemy thus outrageously to speak of the words of Christ. The Bishop, by speaking these words, doth not take upon him to give the Holy Ghost, no more than he doth to remit sins, when he pronounceth the remission of sins: but by speaking these words of Christ, *Receive the Holy Ghost: Whose sins soever ye remit, they are remitted, &c.* he doth shew the principal duty of a minister, and assureth him of the assistance of God’s Holy Spirit, if he labour in the same accordingly. . . . Christ used these words, *This is my body*, in the celebration of His Supper: but there is no special commandment that the minister should use the same, and yet must he use them, because Christ used them: even so, when Christ did ordain his apostles ministers of the Gospel (John xx. 22, 23,) he said unto them, *Receive the Holy Ghost, &c.* which words, because they contain the principal duty of a minister, and do signify that God doth pour his Spirit upon those whom he calleth to that function, are most aptly also used of the bishop (who is God’s instrument in that business) in



‘the ordaining of ministers. St. Paul, speaking to Timothy (1 Tim. iv. 14,) saith, *Neglect not the gift that is in thee, which was given unto thee, by prophesy, with the laying on of the hands of the eldership*: in which words, the apostle signifieth, that God doth bestow his gifts and spirit upon such as be called to the ministry of the word, whereof imposition of hands is a token, or rather a confirmation; and therefore saith Mr. Calvin, *that it was not a vain ceremony, because God did fulfil, with his Spirit, that consecration which men did signify by imposition of hands*: and surely, as that is no vain ceremony, though it be done by men, so these be no vain words, though they be spoken by men.—Neither doth the bishop speak them, as though he had authority to give the Holy Ghost, but he speaketh them *as the words of Christ*, used in the like action, who (as I said before) doth most certainly give his Holy Spirit to those whom he calleth to the ministry: and surely, if any pattern either in calling or ordaining of ministers is to be followed, this of Christ is to be followed especially: and it is not unlike, but that the apostles, when they laid on their hands, used the same words; because (as I have said) laying on of hands is a sign or rather a confirmation of the same. . . . *To recite the words of Christ, in the name of Christ, in the selfsame manner that Christ did speak them, is as lawful in this action as it is in the Supper*, for the bread is not the minister’s body, but the sacrament of Christ his body; and yet he saith, *take and eat; this is my body*. So, in reciting God’s commandments, we say, *thou shalt have no other Gods but me*: and yet we mean not, that we are their Gods; but we speak the words of God, in his person, and in the selfsame manner and form, that he hath left them unto us.’ (See pp. 227, 228.)

12.—On the *Supremacy of Civil Magistrates* and the government of the church under them, Whitgift further affirms: ‘I know that in the primitive church, they had, in every church, certain Seniors, to whom the government of the congregation was committed; but that was before there was any Christian prince or magistrate that openly *professed the gospel, and before there was any church by public authority established, or under civil government*. I told you before, that the diversity of time and state of the church requireth diversity of government in the same.—It cannot be governed in time of prosperity, as it is in time of persecution. It may not be governed under a *Christian prince*,\* which doth

---

\* MILNER, speaking of Ecclesiastical Establishments, says:—‘The gospel is of Divine authority: its fundamentals are revealed with so much clearness, and are of so much consequence to the interests of mankind, that they cannot be rejected without great wickedness of heart: even *the wrath of God* is declared to *abide on him who believeth not the Son*. Under these circumstances, will any man, who thinks it the duty of the supreme power to CONSULT THE GOOD OF THE COMMUNITY, believe it a matter of indifference whether . . . a convenient and well-digested Liturgy, *founded on the genuine principles of Revealed Religion*, be composed for public use, and also whether proper persons and places be provided by the State for the worship of God, and for the instruction of the people? . . . It is certain that, from the earliest ages, AND UNDER PATRIARCHAL GOVERNMENT, when holy men were

‘nourish and maintain it, as it may be under a *tyrant*, when it is  
‘constrained to flee and seek corners.—It cannot be governed in  
‘a whole realm, as it may be in one little city or town.—It cannot  
‘be governed when it is dispersed through many places, as it may  
‘be when it is collected into some one narrow and certain place.  
‘To be short, it cannot be governed when it is full of hypocrites,  
‘papists, atheists and other wicked persons, as when it hath very

‘favoured with Divine revelations, *Governors taught the true religion, and did  
‘not permit their subjects to propagate Atheism, Idolatry, or False Religion.*—  
‘Abraham (Gen. xviii. 19); Isaac (Gen. xxviii. 1); and Jacob (Gen. xxxv.  
‘2), governed their families in this manner, so did Noah before them (Gen.  
‘ix. 25, 26.)—As families grew into NATIONS, the same practical ideas pre-  
‘vailed. At length, when it pleased God to select *One Nation* for his service,  
‘the same sentiments respecting church establishment continued, whether  
‘kings or judges or priests were in possession of executive power. I am  
‘aware that the Jewish government was a *Theocracy*, and that it has therefore  
‘many things peculiar to itself: but so much, perhaps, may safely be inferred  
‘from its constitution, *that it is lawful for the sovereign authority to make regu-  
‘lations for the support of true religion.* It is hardly to be conceived, that God  
‘would interweave into His Theocracy what, in its own nature, is unlawful.  
‘. . . . Can any good argument be invented to prove, that, in the mo-  
‘mentous affair of religion, they (the governing powers) ought not to be  
‘actuated by the grand principle of GENERAL EXPEDIENCY, when, in matters  
‘of less consequence, they evidently shew themselves to be so actuated, and  
‘no one disputes the propriety of their conduct? . . . . Irreligion and  
‘Idolatry provoke the Almighty. A nation wholly given up to them has  
‘reason to fear his vengeance: . . . then let the magistrate act consistently:  
‘let him only adhere to the acknowledged principle, *that the Government  
‘ought to promote the good of the State*, and the reader sees the consequence.  
‘. . . . I say, without the least hesitation, *let no man be COMPELLED to  
‘become a Christian*; in strict truth, he cannot. Every man not only ought  
‘to have, but must have the right of private judgment: and as it is the abso-  
‘lute duty of Christian states, even for social and political purposes, to en-  
‘deavour, as much as possible, to convert all their subjects to the true religion,  
‘so it is contrary to duty that men should be forced to profess what they do  
‘not believe: because *hypocrisy* will be the certain, and an augmented *enmity*  
‘the probable, consequence. It is one thing, however, to leave a man at  
‘liberty whether he will be a believer or not,—another, to allow him to pro-  
‘pagate infidelity and idolatry:—so also, it is *one thing* to violate conscience  
‘by absolutely insisting on and extorting confessions of faith,—*another*, to  
‘preserve the sacred institutions of the country from being derided and pro-  
‘faned. The government has a right to restrain men and oblige them to keep  
‘their irreligion to themselves,—*the same right as to oblige vessels to perform  
‘quarantine, when there is reason to suspect the plague.* In this manner acted  
‘the great, the pious *Theodosius* (the emperor in 379.) He compelled no man.  
‘*He only restrained.* Pagan emperors before him, and Popish princes since,  
‘not only restrained but also *compelled*. The former is not persecution, the  
‘latter is. . . . Job declares that *idolatry was an iniquity to be punished by  
‘the judge.* (xxxi. 28.) He evidently speaks what was confessed by all to be  
‘just. . . . I repeat it, the general arguments drawn from EXPEDIENCY  
‘and the EXAMPLE of the JEWS appear to me to justify the Civil Magistrate,  
‘not only in *instituting and supporting ecclesiastical establishments*, but also in  
‘*restraining and punishing* the propagators of irreligious opinions. . . .  
‘The essentials of Christianity ought, in my judgment, to be effectually pro-  
‘tected by the laws, against the profane and libellous attacks of infidels of  
‘every denomination. I do not think it sufficient to say, *The truth will take  
‘care of itself.* The unlearned and the unwary ought not to be exposed to  
‘the mischievous effects of such publications.’—(See Milner’s *History of the  
Church of Christ*, Vol. 2, pp. 210—217.)

‘few or none such : as commonly it hath not in time of persecution, when the gold is, as it were, by fire tried from the dross. *He that according to this diversity of the form, state and time of the church, doth not allow a diversity of government, doth confound and not edify.* I pray you what Seniors could you have in most parishes in England fit for that office? but wise, not wilful men, have to consider this. *God hath given the chief government of his church to the Christian magistrate, who hath to consider what is most convenient: and we must therewith be content, so that nothing be done against faith, and the commandment of God.* . . . . The civil and Christian magistrate hath that whole authority now, that the seniors had then, and much more, for he may punish with corporal punishment, and so could not they—he may compel and constrain, and so could not they: so that the pastor may be much better aided and assisted in doing his duty and in suppressing vice, by the authority of the Christian magistrate, than he either was then or could be now by the seniors. . . . I say again, that there be in the church (that is, in the *external society* of the church) both papists, atheists, drunkards, &c. and your denial of it I have shewed before to be vain.—I say, further, that those and such like offenders may best be reformed by the civil magistrate and by corporal punishment: as for your seniors, they will not set a straw by them. For as *Gualter*\* saith, (1 Cor. v.) *they which cannot be brought into order, by the authority of a lawful magistrate, and by laws, will much less suffer themselves to be punished by the commandment of Seniors, or of an Ecclesiastical Senate, whom, with all their solemnity, they will laugh to scorn.* . . . . Of the UNIVERSAL CHURCH, ONLY CHRIST IS THE HEAD:† neither hath he any vicerent to supply that universal care over the whole church; but if you speak of *particular churches*, as the Church of England, the Church of Denmark, &c., then as the Prince is chief governor and head of the commonwealth, under God, so is he of the church likewise. For it is certain that the Christian magistrate, under Christ, hath as great authority as the magistrate had under the law:—but then, *the civil magistrates had chief authority, both in matters of the commonwealth and of the church also; . . . therefore the magistrate ought to have the same now, in like manner.* . . . . Both the names and offices of Seniors were extinguished before *Ambrose’s* time,‡ as he himself doth testify, writing upon 1 Tim. v. . . . . Either we must admit another form now of governing the church than was in the apostles’ time, or else we must seclude the Christian magistrate from all authority in ecclesiastical matters, and attribute no more to him therein, than was attributed to Nero in the apostles’ time: for, in those days there was no Christian prince to govern

---

\* The Continental Reformer.

† On page 756, Whitgift remarks: ‘Christ is the head of the church, and spiritually governeth the same in the conscience:—but, because it (the church) hath also an outward and visible form, therefore it requireth an outward and visible government, which *Christ doth execute as well by the civil magistrate as he doth by the ecclesiastical minister.*’

‡ Ambrose flourished about the year 374.



the church.—But Christian princes have, and must have, the chief care and government of the church, next under God;—*Ergo, the same form of government cannot be now, nor ought to be, that was in the apostles' time.*' (See pp. 638, 639, 640, 643, 650, 651, 660.)

13. And of Matters touching Baptism,' Whitgift remarks: 'Interrogatories to be ministered to the infant be not strange, neither lately invented, but of great antiquity.' In proof of this point he cites two passages from St. Augustine,\* in which are to be found the following observations on the use of the sign for the thing signified in the Sacraments:—'*Except Sacraments had a certain similitude and likeness of those things whereof they be Sacraments, they were no Sacraments at all: and by reason of this same similitude, oftentimes they are called by the names of THE THINGS THEMSELVES; therefore, as, after a certain manner of speaking, the Sacrament of the Body of Christ is THE BODY OF CHRIST—the Sacrament of the Blood of Christ is THE BLOOD OF CHRIST; so THE SACRAMENT OF THE FAITH IS FAITH. . . . Therefore although that Faith, which consisteth in the will of the believers, doth not make the child faithful, yet doth THE SACRAMENT OF THAT FAITH MAKE HIM FAITHFUL; for . . . so is he also called faithful, NOT BY SIGNIFYING THE THING ITSELF IN HIS MIND, BUT BY RECEIVING THE SACRAMENT OF THE THING.*' And Whitgift then adds: 'I never heard that any learned man as yet misliked this place of Augustine, but I know they have used it as a most manifest testimony against transubstantiation and the real presence, and as a true declaration wherefore the sacramental bread and wine be called the THE BODY and BLOOD OF CHRIST, being but the Sacraments of the Body and Blood of Christ. . . . And Baptism is truly called by him (Augustine) the Sacrament of Faith, because it is the *Signaculum Justitiæ Fidei*, as Circumcision, the Figure of Baptism, was, according to the word of the Apostle *ad Rom. iv. 11*; and therefore in reproving St. Augustine for calling it (Baptism) the Sacrament of Faith, you (T. C.) seem to be ignorant of this place of the Apostle. To this saying of Augustine doth that of TERTULLIAN,† in his book *De Penitentiâ* very well agree, where he, speaking of Baptism, saith, *That Washing is the Sealing of Faith.*—And CHRYSOSTOME‡ (*Opere imp. Homil. 5 in Matth.*) saith also, *That Baptism is the Seal of Faith*:—neither did ever any man before you mislike this kind and phrase of speech, *That Baptism is the Sacrament of Faith.*' (See pp. 607—609.)

And, towards the close of his work, among other objections urged by Cartwright against the Book of Common Prayer, is one, on the Sacrament of Baptism, thus stated by Whitgift: 'You say, that we attribute to *the sign*, that which is proper to *the work of God*, in the blood of Christ—as though VIRTUE were in water to wash away sin.' To this objection Whitgift thus replies: 'You know, very well, that we teach *far otherwise*, and that it is a

\* Augustine flourished about the year 398.

† Tertullian flourished about the year 200.

‡ Chrysostom flourished about the year 398.

‘certain and true doctrine, of all such as profess the gospel, that  
‘*the outward signs of the sacrament do not contain in them grace,*  
‘*neither yet that the grace of God is of necessity tied unto them ; but*  
‘only, that they be *Seals of God’s promises, Notes of Christianity,*  
‘*Testimonies* and effectual *Signs* of the grace of God, and of our  
‘redemption in Christ Jesus, by the which the Spirit of God doth  
‘invisibly work in us, not only the increase of faith, but confir-  
‘mation also. You understand likewise, that this difference there  
‘is, betwixt these external elements being selected to be sacra-  
‘mental signs (that is, betwixt *water* in baptism and common water  
‘—*bread and wine* in the Eucharist and usual bread and wine) that  
‘*these now be Sacraments* sanctified to another use—to a spiritual  
‘use, to the nourishing of faith, and feeding of the soul—to be in-  
‘struments of the Holy Ghost, by the which, as by instruments, we  
‘be fed to eternal life.—Furthermore, you cannot be ignorant that  
‘whosoever *contemneth these external signs*, and refuseth them, cannot  
‘be a member of Christ, neither yet saved.—Last of all, you have  
‘learned, that there is such a similitude betwixt the Signs and the  
‘Thing signified, that they are not only in Scripture usually called  
‘by the names of those things whereof they be sacraments—as  
‘bread, THE BODY OF CHRIST—and water, REGENERATION—but  
‘also that the contumely or contempt done to the *one* doth redound  
‘to the *other*, that is, *the contempt of the signs is the contempt of the*  
‘*thing signified*, and therefore St. Paul saith, (1 Cor. xi. 29) he that  
‘eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh his own dam-  
‘nation, *not discerning THE LORD’S BODY* ; and Christ (John iii. 5,)   
‘except a man be born of water and THE SPIRIT, he cannot enter  
‘into the kingdom of heaven.—These things being considered, it  
‘is no superstitious toy, but a godly and true saying, that Christ  
‘hath sanctified all waters (used in baptizing) *to the mystical washing*  
‘*away of sin* ; not ascribing or attributing washing away of sin, to  
‘the external element, any otherwise than instrumentally, or *in any*  
‘*other respect than for the similitude that sacraments have with the*  
‘*things whereof they be sacraments* : for we know that wicked men  
‘may receive these external signs, and yet remain the members of  
‘Satan.’\* (p. 738.)

The following observations and appeal from Whitgift to the enemies of the Reformed English Church in his day, may not be an unsuitable close to the preceding extracts from his work :—‘ In  
‘the beginning of your book you call it *a true platform of a church*  
‘*reformed* ; and, I dare say, you think it to be as perfect a form of a  
‘church as all the best-learned and godliest men in the world could  
‘frame ; for *it is well known, that men of your disposition think com-*  
‘*monly as well of themselves as they do of any man else, and better too.*  
‘But we grant unto you, that you are so far from setting down a

---

\* The statements here made by Whitgift clearly show the received opinion of the church, on the subject of Baptismal Regeneration, *twelve years after the settling of our present Thirty-nine Articles* ; and, if needed, might be referred to as a further collateral proof in favour of the sentiments already advanced on that important subject.

perfect state of a church reformed, that you may rather be called *confounders and deformers, than builders and reformers*. God grant that you may become builders and not destroyers. I think, indeed, you have but begun. *I know there is other opinions among you which be not yet commonly known*; and truly, I doubt that you will never end, but from time to time coin new devices to trouble the church, until you have brought that HEAVY PLAGUE OF GOD upon us, which the like kind of men, through their schisms and heresies, have brought upon all those places almost, where any of the apostles preached, and where the gospel was first planted; and commonly, before Ruin and Destruction, cometh inward Discord and Domestical Dissension.\* The Lord make us thankful for the purity of his gospel, that we, by his mercy, enjoy—the Lord root out schisms and factions from among us, and either convert or confound the authors of them—the Lord, of his singular goodness, continue our gracious Queen Elizabeth unto us, and give us faithful and obedient hearts to his Word and to her Majesty. Amen.' (p. 705.)

(See "*The Defense of the Aunswere to the Admonition, against the Replie of T. C. by John Whitgift, Doctor of Divinitie.*" 1 Cor. viii. 2; Gal. v. 26. London, fol. edit. 1574.)

## H O O K E R,

The learned, godly, and judicious author of "*The Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*,"—died in 1603.

1.—In the third book, (after speaking of 'the difference between matters of Perpetual Necessity to all men's salvation, and matters of Ecclesiastical Polity—the *one* both fully and plainly taught in Holy Scripture, the *other* not necessary to be, in such sort, there

---

\* Whitgift, speaking of the Admonitioners as Libellers and Underminers and not Builders, describes the confusion which would arise from the adoption of the form of Church Government proposed by them, in the following terms: 'Take from bishops their lands and their authority—let every parish elect their own minister—remove Homilies, Articles, Injunctions—appoint no prescript Order of Service; that is to say, let there be no order prescribed to any man—no law to direct him or control him; but let every minister *do* what he list, *speak* what he list, *alter* what he list, and *so oft* as him list:—to be short, let every minister be king and pope in his own parish, and exempted from all controlment of Bishop, Magistrate, and Prince; and you shall have as many *kinds of religion*, as there is parishes—as many *sects* as ministers—and a church miserably torn in pieces, with mutability and diversity of opinions. Do you not see what they shoot at? Would they not be free from all magistracy? Do they not most ambitiously desire *that* themselves which they condemn in other—that is, lordship and superiority? For who, think you, should be chief in every parish, and direct the rest?—Surely, even the minister. The pope never required greater authority over all Christendom, than they seek to have over their parish. The pope and his clergy did never more earnestly seek and desire to be exempted from the jurisdiction of civil magistrates, than these men do both from ecclesiastical and civil. Princes, nobles, and magistrates were never brought into greater servitude and bondage, than these men seek to lay upon them.' (See pp. 559, 560.)



‘prescribed; the *one* not capable of any diminution or augmentation ‘at all by men, the *other* apt to admit both,’) Hooker observes:—  
 ‘Unto the complete Form of Church Polity, much may be requisite  
 ‘which the Scripture teacheth not; and much which it hath taught  
 ‘become unrequisite; sometime, because we *need not* use it—  
 ‘sometimes also because we *cannot*. In which respect, *for mine*  
 ‘*own part*, although I see that certain Reformed Churches, the SCOT-  
 ‘TISH especially and FRENCH, have not that which best agreeth  
 ‘with the Sacred Scripture—I mean, THE GOVERNMENT THAT IS  
 ‘BY BISHOPS—inasmuch as both those Churches are fallen under  
 ‘a different kind of Regiment; which, to remedy it, is for the one  
 ‘altogether too late and too soon for the other, during their present  
 ‘affliction and trouble. This, their defect and imperfection, I had  
 ‘rather lament in such case than exaggerate; considering that men,  
 ‘oftentimes without any fault of their own, may be driven to want  
 ‘that kind of polity or regiment which is best, and to content them-  
 ‘selves with that, which either the irremediable error of former time  
 ‘or the necessity of the present hath cast upon them.’ (Book iii.  
 sec. 11, p. 90.)

2.—In the seventh book, Hooker also writes as follows:—‘St.  
 ‘Jerome’s admonition is reasonable, sensible and plain, being con-  
 ‘trived to this effect—the ruling superiority of one bishop over  
 ‘many presbyters in each church is an order descended from Christ  
 ‘to the apostles, who were themselves *bishops at large*; and from the  
 ‘apostles to those whom they, in their steads, appointed *bishops over*  
 ‘*particular countries and cities*; and even from those ancient times,  
 ‘universally established, thus many years it hath continued through-  
 ‘out the world. For which cause, PRESBYTERS must not grudge  
 ‘to continue subject unto their bishops, unless they will proudly  
 ‘oppose themselves against that which God himself ordained by his  
 ‘apostles, and the whole church of Christ approveth and judgeth  
 ‘most convenient. On the other side BISHOPS, albeit they may  
 ‘avouch with conformity of truth, that their authority hath thus  
 ‘descended even from the very apostles themselves; yet the ab-  
 ‘solute and everlasting continuance of it, they cannot say that any  
 ‘commandment of the Lord doth enjoin. . . . Wherefore  
 ‘lest bishops forget themselves, as if none on earth had authority to  
 ‘touch their states, let them continually bear in mind that it is  
 ‘rather the force of custom, whereby the church having so long  
 ‘found it good to continue under the regiment of her virtuous  
 ‘bishops, doth still uphold, maintain, and honour them in that  
 ‘respect, than that any such true and heavenly law can be shewed,  
 ‘by the evidence whereof it may of a truth appear, that the Lord  
 ‘himself hath appointed presbyters for ever to be under the  
 ‘regiment of bishops, in what sort soever they behave themselves.’  
 (Book vii. sec. 5, p. 12.)

3.—And in the same seventh book, Hooker states:—‘Whereas  
 ‘some do infer that no ordination can stand but only such as is  
 ‘made by bishops, which have had their ordination likewise by other  
 ‘bishops before them, till we come to the very apostles of Christ  
 ‘themselves. In which respect, it was demanded of Beza, at

Poissie, *By what authority he could administer the Holy Sacraments, being not thereunto ordained by any other than Calvin, or by such as to whom the power of ordination did not belong, according to the ancient orders and customs of the church; since Calvin and they who joined with him in that action were no bishops.* . . . . To this we answer, that there may be sometimes very just and sufficient reason to allow ordination made without a bishop.\* Hooker affirms,—‘The whole church visible, (being the true original subject of all power) it hath not *ordinarily* allowed any other than bishops alone to ordain:—Howbeit, as the ordinary course is ordinarily in all things to be observed, so it may be, in some cases, not unnecessary that we decline from the ordinary ways. Men may be *extraordinarily yet allowably two ways* admitted unto spiritual functions in the church. One is, when God himself doth, of himself, raise up any whose labour he useth, without requiring that men should authorize them; but then he doth ratify their calling, by manifest signs and tokens himself from heaven: and thus, even such as believed not our Saviour’s teaching, did yet acknowledge him a lawful teacher sent from God—*Thou art a teacher sent from God, otherwise none could do those things which thou doest*, (John iii. 2.) . . . . Another extraordinary kind of vocation is, when the exigence of necessity doth constrain to leave the usual ways of the church, which otherwise we would willingly keep; where the church must needs have some ordained, and neither hath, nor can have possibly, a bishop to ordain. In case of such necessity, the ordinary institution of God hath given oftentimes, and may give place. And therefore we are not, simply without exception, to urge a lineal descent of power from the Apostles by continued Succession of Bishops in every effectual Ordination. These cases of inevitable necessity excepted, none may ordain but only bishops.’ (Book vii. sec. 14, pp. 37, 38.)

(See Hooker’s *Eccl. Pol.* by Dr. Gauden, Bishop of Exeter, fol. edit. 1662.)

## M A S O N,

Archdeacon of Norfolk—died 1621,

Wrote a Defence of ‘The Validity of the Ordination of the Ministers of the Reformed Churches beyond the Seas, maintained against the Romanists.’\*

1.—In this work, (after citing the highest authorities in the Romish church to show that a bishop and priest are of the same

---

\* Dr. Bernard, chaplain to Archbishop Usher, in noticing this work, tells us: ‘I have been assured it was not only the judgment of Bishop Overal, but that he (Overal) had a principal hand in it.’—(See Bernard’s *Judgment of the late Archbishop of Armagh*, edit. 1657, p. 133.) The present Bishop of London, in his third Sermon “*On the Church*,” quotes from this work, and speaks of Mason as ‘The learned defender of our Ordinations and of those of the Foreign Reformed Churches.’

order\*), to the inquiry, 'What then doth a bishop receive in his 'consecration?'—the Archdeacon replies:—'He receiveth a Sacred 'Office, an Eminency, a Jurisdiction, a Dignity, a Degree of Ecclesiastical pre-eminence. . . . He hath no higher degree in respect of 'intention or extension of the *Character*; but he hath a higher 'degree, that is, a more excellent place in respect of *Authority and 'Jurisdiction* in spiritual Regiment. Wherefore, seeing a Presbyter is 'equal to a Bishop in the power of Order, he hath equally intrinsical 'power to give Orders.' †

2.—On the *Pre-eminence of Bishops*, the Archdeacon observes: 'When the Apostles advanced Bishops, the power of Presbyters 'was . . . *restrained*, not utterly *extinguished*; as the faculty 'of the flying of a bird, when his wings are tied.'—And in reply to the inquiry, 'Was the advancing of Bishops the restraint of 'Presbyters?'—Then they were restrained *Jure Divino*, because the 'pre-eminence of Bishops is *Jure Divino*;' Mason asserts: 'First, 'if you mean by *Jure Divino* that which is according to the Scripture, then the pre-eminence of Bishops is *Jure Divino*, for it hath 'been already proved to be according to the *Scripture*. Secondly, if

---

\* There are indeed, as the Preface to the Ordination Services states, '*these Ministers in Christ's church—Bishops, Priests, and Deacons*: for though, in one sense, the order of Bishop may be said to be the same as that of Priest, yet in another sense it may be said to be different. The Bishop is of the same order as the Presbyter, in respect to his *priestly character*, though, in respect to his *office*, he is of a different order from the Presbyter; inasmuch as he possesses peculiar rights and pre-eminence, and has peculiar duties to perform. Such is the view taken by the best authorities of the Church of England. The martyr CRANMER writes thus: 'The truth is that, in the New Testament, 'there is no mention made of any degrees and distinctions in orders, but only '*Deacons* or Ministers, and of '*Priests* or Bishops.'—(See Cranmer's *Institution of a Christian Man*, 4to. edit. 1537, fol. 42.) The martyr LAMBERT writes thus: 'In the primitive church . . . there were no more officers in the church 'than Bishops and Deacons. . . . Those whom we call *Priests* were all 'one and none other but Bishops, and the *Bishops* none other but *Priests*.'—(See Foxe's *Acts*, &c. 8vo. edit. 1838, Vol. 5, p. 190.) And WHITGIFT writes thus: 'If we consider the writings of the apostles, it will evidently appear 'that *Presbyter* is usually taken for *Episcopus* or Minister or Pastor, as 1 Peter 'v. 1, 2; *The Elders which are among you, I beseech, which am myself also an 'elder*, &c.; *Feed the flock*, &c. And in the Acts xx. 17, 18, St. Paul calleth 'the same men *Seniors and Bishops*; and by *Seniors* meaneth none other than 'Bishops and Pastors, as it is evident in that place. Likewise Titus, i. 5, 7, 'he saith, that *Titus was left at Crete, that he should appoint elders in every city*; 'and declaring what qualities they ought to have, he addeth, *a Bishop must be 'unreproveable*, &c. Whereby it is manifest that he taketh them both for one.'—(See *Defence of Answer to Admonition*, pp. 626, 627.) It is observable also, that the Ordination Services of the English Church speak first of the *Ordering* of Deacons, and then of the *Ordering* of Priests; but when they come to the Form of making Bishops, they never call it *Ordering*, but always *Consecrating*.—Further remarks on the parity of the sacerdotal character in Presbyters and Bishops, will be found in the Extract from the writings of Abp. Usher.

† The sentiment, it is presumed, intended to be expressed is simply this, (viz.) that a Presbyter or Priest, having the full sacerdotal character, is *intrinsically* capable of passing that character to others, *when an office or jurisdiction is given him*, wherein such power may be regularly and canonically exercised—a case exactly suited to the Foreign Reformed Churches, the validity of whose ordinations Mason was maintaining.



‘by *Jure Divino*, you mean the ordinance of God; in this sense also it may be said to be *Jure Divino*: for it is an ordinance of the Apostles, whereunto they were directed by God’s Spirit, even by the spirit of Prophecy, and consequently the ordinance of God. But if by *Jure Divino* you understand a *Law and Commandment of God*, binding all Christian churches universally, perpetually, unchangeably, and with such absolute necessity, that no other form of regiment may in any case be admitted; in this sense neither may we grant it, nor yet can you prove it to be *Jure Divino*. . . . The Apostles in their lifetime ordained many Bishops, and left a fair pattern to posterity.—The Church, following the commodiousness thereof, embraced it in all ages through the Christian world.

3.—The Archdeacon then proceeds to defend the validity of the Ordinations in the Foreign Reformed Churches, on the ground of *Necessity*, thus: ‘It was the duty of Magistrates, whose hearts the Lord had touched, not to suffer false Prophets, but to drive them away like wolves, and to plant godly Preachers in their places: but whence should they have them? The Popish Priests converted were like a few clusters in a great vintage, or a few mariners in a great ship: wherefore *either there must be a new supply, or the ship of Christ must be endangered*. And there was but one way for this supply, to wit, by *Ordination*. Now the Bishops were so far from yielding it in any tolerable manner, that they persecuted such as sought the Reformation, and branded them with schism and heresy: Wherefore it must either be devolved unto presbyters, or the church of God must suffer most lamentable ruin and desolation. And was not this a case of *Necessity*?—I will conclude this point with a memorable saying of Waldensis, worthy to be written in letters of gold.—(Thom. Waldens. *Doct. Fidei*. Tom. 1, lib. 2, cap. 8, sec. 2.) *When these two things do meet in the state of the church, to wit, extreme necessity admitting no delay, and the hopeless want of ability to yield relief in the ordinary pastor or guide, we must seek an extraordinary Father, before the fabric of the Lord Jesus be dissolved.*’

4.—And in reply to the objection, ‘Suppose that ordination might be devolved to presbyters, in case of necessity, yet, the necessity ceasing, such extraordinary courses should likewise cease. Why then do they continue their former practice? *Why do they not now seek to receive their orders from Protestant Bishops?*’ The Archdeacon replies: ‘The churches of Germany need not to seek to foreign Bishops, because they have *Superintendents* or *Bishops* among themselves: and as for other places which embrace the discipline of Geneva, they also have Bishops in effect; for two things, of all other, are most proper to Bishops: (1) *Singularity in succeeding*; because though there be many Presbyters in a Church, yet, above the rest, there is *one Star, one Angel*, of whose unity depends the unity of the Church: and therefore when he dieth, another must succeed in the like singularity. (2) *Superiority in ordaining*; because ever since the Apostles’ times, these Stars and Angels have been invested with the power of ordination, which they might perform without Presbyters, but Presbyters might not

‘regularly perform without them. Now in these Reformed Churches, the *President* of each Presbytery is their Star or Angel, endued with both properties. Concerning the first, Beza saith, *This was essential in the matter we have in hand: that by God’s perpetual ordinance, it hath been, is, and shall be needful, that some one in the presbytery, which is first both in place and dignity, should have the pre-eminence in ruling of every action, with that right which is given him from God.* Therefore concerning the second, whereas the Presbytery consisteth partly of Ministers, partly of Laymen; their Lay-presbyters are wholly excluded from ordination; for Calvin teacheth, that, in the apostolic times, *only Pastors imposed hands*—neither is it lawful for every pastor in the presbytery to execute this office; but it is reserved to him who is *first* both in place and dignity, having pre-eminence in every action, and consequently in Ordination. Wherefore, though that he do it not by his *sole authority*, but with *common consent*, neither hath the name of a Bishop, or such ample titles annexed as godly Princes have thought fit for the honour of the place (because these things are not suitable with *popular estates*, delighting in equality), yet he hath *the substance of the office itself*, which he exerciseth, not in one only particular parish, but in the city, suburbs, and the territories thereof, containing sundry parishes—as, for example, at Geneva, *xxiv.* or thereabout.—Wherefore, seeing a Bishop and a Presbyter do not differ in *order*, but only in *pre-eminence and jurisdiction*, as yourselves acknowledge; and seeing Calvin and Beza had the order of priesthood, (which is the highest order in the church of God) and were lawfully chosen the one after the other, to a place of eminency and endued with jurisdiction derived unto them from the whole church wherein they lived, you cannot, with reason, deny them *the Substance of the Episcopal Office*; and, whereinsoever their discipline is defective, we wish them, even in the bowels of Christ Jesus, by all possible means, to redress and reform it, and to conform themselves to the ancient custom of the church of Christ, which hath continued from the *Apostles’ time*, that so they may remove all opinion of singularity, and stop the mouth of malice itself.—Thus much concerning the ministers of other Reformed Churches, wherein, if you will not believe us, disputing for the lawfulness of their calling, yet you must give us leave to believe God himself, from heaven, approving their ministry, by pouring down a blessing upon their labours.—Bless them still, O Lord, and bless us; and make all our ministry faithful, fruitful, and effectual, to the comfort of our own consciences, the advancing of thy kingdom, the joy of thy little flock, and to the recalling of those lost sheep, which, as yet, wander in the wilderness of the church of Rome, or elsewhere; that so it may be powerful, by thy Spirit, to the salvation of many thousand souls. Amen.’

(See *Certain Brief Treatises written by divers learned Men, concerning the Ancient and Modern Government of the Church.* Oxford edition, 1641, pp. 160—163, 172—176.)

## USHER,

Archbishop of Armagh, 1626—died 1656,

at the close of his long life,\* wrote as follows: ‘I have ever declared my opinion to be that *Episcopus et Presbyter gradu tantum differunt, non Ordine*,† and consequently that in places where Bishops cannot be had, the ordination by Presbyters standeth valid; yet, on the other side, holding as I do, that a Bishop hath superiority in degree above a Presbyter, you may easily judge that the ordination made by such presbyters as have severed themselves from those bishops unto whom they had sworn canonical obedience, cannot possibly by me be excused from being Schismatical. And howsoever I must needs think that the Churches which have no Bishops are thereby become very much defective in their government; and that the churches in France who, living under a Popish power, cannot do what they would, are more excusable in this defect than the Low Countries that live under a free state, yet, for the testifying my communion with these Churches, (which I do love and honour as true members of the Church Universal,) I do profess that, with like affection,

---

\* He died in the seventy-sixth year of his age.

† Dr. Bernard, chaplain to Archbishop Usher, compares the superiority of the Bishop over Presbyters, to the splendor of the *Sun and Moon* (the greater lights ordained of God) over the other lights of the firmament (Gen. i.) and also to the pre-eminence of the *First-born* over their brethren. All were Lights—all were Brethren; but a certain degree of excellency, or supremacy of dignity and power, was assigned to some, to which others must be subject—“*Gradu tantum differunt non Ordine.*”—(See *Judgment of the late Archbishop of Armagh*, by Bernard. Edit. 1657, p. 128)—Bishop Davenant is also mentioned by Bernard, as holding the same views on the parity of the sacerdotal character in Presbyters and Bishops; and the testimonies of Cranmer, Lambert, and Whitgift, on this point, are referred to in the note on the Extracts from Archdeacon Mason’s writings.—To these also may be added many others. Bishop JEWELL asks: ‘Is it so horrible an heresy as he (Harding) maketh it, to say that, by the Scriptures of God, a bishop and a priest are all one? Or knoweth he how far and unto whom he reacheth the name of an heretic? Verily Chrysostom saith, *Between a Bishop and a Priest, in a manner, there is no difference* (in 1 Tim. Hom. ii.)—St. Jerome saith, somewhat in a rougher sort, ‘*I hear there is one become so peevish, that he setteth deacons before priests, that is to say, before bishops: whereas the apostle plainly teacheth us that priests and bishops be all one.*—(Ad Evagrium.) St. Augustine saith, ‘What is a bishop but the first priest, that is to say, the High Priest?—(In *questionib. Novi et Veter. Test.* Qu. 101.) So saith St. Ambrose, There is but one consecration of priest and bishop: for both of them are priests, but the bishop is the first.—(De Dignit. Sacerdot.) All these and other more holy fathers, together with St. Paul the Apostle, for thus saying, by Mr. Harding’s advice, must be holden for heretics.’—(See Jewell’s *Defence*, folio edit. 1609, p. 202.)—The martyr BRADFORD, in his conference with the papist Harpsfield, says, ‘Tell me whether that the Scripture knew any difference between Bishops and ministers which ye call Priests?’—Harpsfield answers, ‘No.’—(See Foxe’s *Acts*, &c. 8vo. edition, 1838, Vol. 7, p. 170.)—And Bishop PILKINGTON says, ‘The privileges and superiorities which bishops have above other ministers, are rather granted by man for maintaining of better order and quietness in commonwealths, than commanded by God in his Word.’—(See Pilkington’s *Works*, Parker Society edit. 1842, p. 493.)



‘*I should receive the blessed Sacrament at the hands of the Dutch ministers if I were in Holland, as I should do at the hands of the French ministers if I were in Charentone.*’ \*

(See *Judgment of the late Archbishop of Armagh*, by Dr. Bernard. London edition, 1657, pp. 125—127.)

And Dr. Bernard, also in the same work, makes the following observation: ‘If the ordination of presbyters in such places where bishops cannot be had, were not valid, the late Bishops of Scotland had a hard task to maintain themselves to be bishops, who were not priests, *for their ordination was no other*. And for this, a passage in the History of Scotland, wrote by the Archbishop of St. Andrews, is observable (viz.) That when the Scots bishops were to be consecrated by the Bishops of London, Ely, and Bath, here at London House, An. 1609, he saith—A question was moved by Dr. Andrews, Bishop of Ely, touching the consecration of the Scottish bishops who, as he said, must first be ordained Presbyters, as having received no Ordination from a Bishop. The Archbishop of Canterbury (Dr. Bancroft) who was by, maintained *That thereof there was no necessity, seeing where bishops could not be had, the ordination given by the presbyters must be esteemed lawful—otherwise that it might be doubted, if there were any lawful vocation in most of the Reformed Churches*. This applauded to by the other bishops, Ely acquiesced, and, at the day and in the place appointed, the three Scottish Bishops were consecrated by the abovesaid three English Bishops.’ (See pp. 134—136.)

## H A L L,

Bishop of Norwich, 1641—died 1656,

writes thus: ‘Blessed be God, there is no difference in any essential matter betwixt the church of England and her Sisters of the Reformation. We accord in every point of Christian doctrine, without the least variation. Their public confessions and ours are sufficient convictions to the world of our full and absolute agreement. The only difference is in the form of outward administration; wherein also we are so far agreed, as that *we all profess this form not to be essential to the Being of a Church, though much importing the Well or Better-being of it*, according to our several apprehensions thereof: and that we do all retain a reverent and loving opinion of each other, in our own several ways, not seeing any reason why so poor a diversity should work any alienation of affection in us one towards another.’—(See Bishop Hall’s *Select Works* by Pratt, 8vo. edit., 1811, Vol. 5, p. 56.)

---

\* A town of France, famous for its Protestant church.

## CONCLUSION.

## DUTY OF CONFORMITY TO THE NATIONAL CHURCH.

DR. BLOMFIELD,

Bishop of London,

In his third Sermon *On the Church*, preached in 1842, speaks of the Foreign Reformed Churches in the following terms: 'The more exclusive view of the subject, which peremptorily shuts out all such Christian communities from the true church, and treats them as heretical and schismatical, I consider to be more in accordance with the intolerant arrogance which breathes in the decrees of the Council of Trent, than with the wise and pious caution that pervaded the Synod of our own church which framed her Articles of Faith. It is said, indeed, that those holy and prudent men were purposely wary and reserved in their definitions of church government, for fear of giving offence to the Foreign Reformed Churches. I believe their caution to have proceeded rather from a religious fear of deciding peremptorily that which is not peremptorily decided in the Word of God; and of *excluding from any of the benefits of the Christian economy, those who have not been formally excluded therefrom by Jesus Christ and his apostles.*' And the Bishop then proceeds to offer these remarks,—'I would once more observe, that these considerations bear only upon the case of the Reformed Churches of other countries, and that they have no force with reference to seceders from our own National Church. . . . When people of the same community separate themselves from the church of that community, not differing from it in fundamentals . . . they may not be chargeable with *heresy*; but I do not understand how they can escape the guilt of *Schism*.\* . . . If our church be a true branch of the catholic church, . . . it is impossible that separation from it should not be schismatical. Those who leave or keep aloof from its communion, do not endeavour to *keep the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace*.—It is no justification of such conduct, that many of those who practice it are men of a holy life and conversation: nor does it follow that their forms of church

---

\* "DIVISIONS—Forbidden and condemned, 1 Cor. i. 10; 1 Cor. xi. 18, 19; Judges v. 15, 16.

————— A proof of worldliness of spirit, 1 Cor. iii. 3; James iv. 1.

————— Danger of, Gal. v. 15.

————— Unbecoming the church of Christ, 1 Cor. xii. 25—27.

————— Contrary to the design and spirit of the gospel, John xvii. 23; Rom. xv. 6; 1 Cor. i. 13.

————— We should avoid those that cause, Rom. xvi. 17; Gal. i. 7, 8.

————— Evil of, illustrated, Matt. xii. 25."

(*"Scripture Texts arranged,"* compiled by the Irish Tract and Book Society. Dublin, 1841.)—ED.

‘government are lawful, because the labours of their ministers or teachers may have been productive of some good. As long as the fundamental truths of the gospel are preached, even though it be of *contention*, they will not be wholly void of effect; but whatever good may be accomplished by such means, is *in a great degree counterbalanced by the certain evils of schism*; and might be accomplished more surely, and effectually, and lastingly, by a faithful use of those ordinances which are formally of *Apostolic* and virtually of *Divine* institution. No man can justify his voluntary separation from the National Church, but upon the ground that she requires of him the profession of some article of faith, *at variance with the fundamental truths of the gospel*, or the performance of some act of worship forbidden, either expressly or implicitly, by the Word of God. This principle was acknowledged, and for some time acted upon, by the English Puritans, who disapproved of certain expressions and forms and practices and rules, insisted upon by the church of England, and yet did not feel themselves at liberty to leave her communion; but *now*, for slighter reasons, or for none at all, many are either guilty of schism themselves, or countenance and justify it in others.’

#### THE REV. WILLIAM GOODE,

in his work on *The Divine Rule of Faith and Practice*,\* observes: ‘Ministration in sacred things is confined to the clergy for the sake of ecclesiastical order; which order, as it was ordained by God, so a needless infraction of it will doubtless be visited, more or less, according to circumstances, with the marks of his displeasure. . . . If there is a sufficient reason to justify the people in breaking that prescribed ecclesiastical order, and separating themselves from their clergy, there is no essential impediment—*where the necessity of the case requires it*—to their appointing some from among themselves to fulfil the ministerial function. And a sufficient reason there is, if the faith has been corrupted, and the terms of communion rendered sinful; and hence, we doubt not, a secession from the Church of Rome, had it been made by laymen only, would have been justifiable, and the seceders fully authorized to appoint a ministry from among themselves (if they could obtain none *apostolically* commissioned to join with them in their secession) and expect the Divine blessing upon their ministrations. Such a secession would certainly have met with the approbation of Cyprian. . . . Hence the culpability of such separations depends entirely upon the circumstances under which they are made. . . . The consequence is, that the question of union or separation is a case of conscience, in which each man must act according to the light which he possesses. And though a man may err in his decision, and thereby even disturb the peace of the church, and bring much evil upon himself and others, and perhaps expose

---

\* See Vol. 2, pp. 114—119.



himself to punishment, I should be loath to maintain that, if he has acted with sincerity, and holds the fundamentals of the faith, and regulates his life correspondently, he is not a member of Christ's visible church: and one, moreover, who is, upon the whole, in a state of salvation. The true notion of a church (says Dean Sherlock) is the *Cætus Fidelium*, or the company of the faithful, of those who profess the true faith of Christ, and are united to him by Baptism. . . . Nothing can separate us from the Catholic Church but what forfeits our Christianity—either a final apostacy or such heresies as are equivalent to apostacy. . . . Schism and separation is a breach of the external and visible communion of the church, not of the essential unity of it. The church is one church still, whatever breaches and schisms there are in its external communion: for the unity of the Catholic Church consists in the union of the whole to Christ, which makes them *One Body in Him*—not in the external communion of the several parts of it to each other. And therefore it is not a separation from one another, but only a separation from Christ, which is a separation from the Catholic Church.—(See *Discourse concerning the Nature, Unity, and Comm. of the Catholic Church*, pp. 32, 52, 53.)

There may be one Lord, one Faith, one Baptism, to those who are not in external communion with one another. There may be therefore a spiritual relationship, where, through the infirmity of the flesh, that relationship is not recognized, and does not issue in communion: just as men may be members of one family, who do not live together, in friendly communion, as of one family. The doctrine of our church, therefore, on the subject of church government, may, I hope, be fully maintained, where it is not considered to involve any such anathemas as our opponents launch against those who have separated from her communion, or to consign any to God's uncovenanted mercies who are sound in the fundamentals of the faith, and of a life correspondent to their professed faith, however erroneous may be their notions of ecclesiastical polity. . . . Here then I leave the case which we are now considering, as I have no inclination to find apologies for those needless schisms and divisions by which our church has been rent in pieces, and the cause of Christ both here and, if here, throughout the world seriously injured.\* Let it not be supposed that, in the remarks we have just offered there was any wish to throw a shield over such irregularities or to make light of unnecessary divisions in the church. Far from it. *We believe them to be sinful.* Nay more—the evils inherent in schism and forms of church-government devised by the fancy of man, are such as generally bring their own punishment with them in this world. There is not the same stability in such communions. They are the rendezvous for men of unquiet and turbulent spirit, whose influence

\* The Rev. Edward Bickersteth, writing on Church Government, says, 'I cannot be blind to all the evils of divisions among Christians in our land—the causes of which all sides will have to give account of in the day of Christ. . . . We have all of us deep cause for Humiliation!'—(See Bickersteth's *Divine Warning to the Church*, p. 71.)—ED.

‘upon their respective communities is anything but favourable to genuine piety, and even the peace of society. They are many of them, for the sake, as it is admitted, of non-essentials, placing impediments to the progress of that cause which they profess to have most at heart: nay, from an avowed feeling of jealousy, we have seen many of them, in the last few years, with a spirit of uncompromising hostility, waging war against the privileges of our Apostolical National Church, from which they have separated, and banding together with Romanists, heretics, and infidels, for the purpose of overthrowing her influence, . . . and, in a word, of razing her to the ground. Surely, of such we must say, in the words of Irenæus, *God will judge those who produce schisms, who are destitute of the love of God, contemplating their own profit and not the unity of the church, and for the sake of small and trifling causes, dividing and splitting into parts, the great and glorious body of Christ, and as far as in them lies, slaying it: who have peace in their mouth and war in their acts—who, in very deed, strain at a gnat and swallow a camel.* We neither agree, therefore, with those who leave them to the uncovenanted mercies of God, nor with those who are countenancing them in their mistaken course. And it is a matter for the serious consideration of all those members of our church, who believe that God is a God of peace and order, and that unnecessary schisms and divisions in his church are displeasing to him, how far they would be acting agreeably to his will in making light of such divisions, and *fraternizing with those who are unnecessarily quarrelling with the constituted order of things in the church, in which God had placed them, and are even seeking to deprive it of all the external privileges, with which, in the providence of God, the piety of former ages has endowed it.*’

#### ST. PAUL.

‘I beseech you, brethren, by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye *all speak the same thing, and that there be no divisions among you*: but that ye be perfectly joined together, in the same mind, and in the same judgment.’ (1 Cor. i. 10.)

‘Whereas there is among you *envying, and strife and divisions*: are ye not carnal and walk as men?’ (1 Cor. iii. 3.)

‘I beseech you, that ye walk worthy of the vocation wherewith ye are called, with all lowliness and meekness, with long-suffering, forbearing one another in love, *endeavouring to keep the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace.*’ (Eph. iv. 1—3.)

‘Grace be with all them that love our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity.’ (Eph. vi. 24.)

‘I SPEAK AS TO WISE MEN, JUDGE YE WHAT I SAY.’  
(1 Cor. x. 15.)

## POSTSCRIPT.

Since this edition was sent to press, a communication from the Rev. Professor D'Aubigné to the Editor of "*The Record*," has appeared in that paper, stating that search had been made at Geneva for the correspondence between Cranmer and Calvin, alluded to in the note on page 10, without effect; though an intimation has been since given by the Editor, that there was reason to think it not impossible it was to be found at *Zoffinger, in the Canton of Bern*. Dr. D'Aubigné closes his communication with the following remarks:—"I do not think the passage sought for very necessary. *I do not hesitate to say, that I look upon, as regenerated, every human being, whatever his age may be, who has answered, with truth and reality, the several questions put in your Baptismal Service*—(1) The minister says, *Wilt thou be baptized in this faith?* The answer is, *That is my desire, &c.*—(2) If the infant expresses *truly and really* the desire to be baptized in the faith that has been confessed, *he is truly and really regenerated.*—(3) But if the infant has *not really* made this confession, then *neither has he really* received this grace.—(4) *If the answer of the infant, in the middle of the service, is an Hypothesis, his regeneration, declared at the end of the service, is also Hypothetical.*—(5) The godfather confesses the *faith* which the infant is to hold, the minister declares the *grace* he is to receive. These two things are simultaneous: *they refer to the same time.* To admit that one of them (the DECLARATION on the part of the infant) is a thing future, and to pretend that the other (the REGENERATION of the infant) is a thing present—is not only opposed to the Word of God, and contrary to theology, but is also opposed to philosophy, and *contrary to grammar.*"—(See *Record*, May 15 and 18, 1843.) The sentiments here expressed on the subject of Baptismal Regeneration, are confirmatory of those advanced in the preceding pages: and the view taken of the Baptismal Services of the English Church, it is humbly trusted, will be satisfactory to tender consciences; especially when it is remembered that Dr. D'Aubigné is a man pre-eminently distinguished both for his piety and talent, and is himself a minister, not of the Reformed English Church, but, of one of the Foreign Reformed Churches.

---

## ERRATA.

For "*Jewell's Defence of his Apology*," in the Notes on pages 22 and 27, read "*Jewell's Reply to Harding's Answer concerning the XXVII. Articles.*"

---

AN ABRIDGED EDITION is in the press, printed in smaller type and on thin paper, under one ounce in weight, for the convenience of Circulation, and may be had, free of Postage, on sending a Post-office Order to the Author (payable at Norwich), at the rate of 10s. per packet—each packet containing Twelve Tracts.



